WOMAN'S UNFITNESS FOR HIGHER COEDUCATION

WOMAN'S UNFITNESS FOR HIGHER COEDUCATION

BY

ELY VAN DE WARKER, M.D.,
Commissioner of Schools, Syracuse, New York

THE GRAFTON PRESS
NEW YORK

Copyright 1903 by THE GRAFTON PRESS

First Impression, December, 1903

LC1601
.V3

THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS,
Two Copies Received
DEC 23 1903
Copyright Entry
Dec. 23-1903
CLASS a XXc. No.
75399
COPY B.

2

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

To

Mrs. Emma Hart Willard,

Born at Berlin, Connecticut, in 1787, who, believing that American women were in need of higher and broader education, founded an institution of college rank for women at Waterford, New York, which at the solicitation of the citizens of Troy, New York, was transferred to that city in 1819, and became famous as the Troy Female Seminary and spread abroad a high and liberal culture which has inspired and refined thousands of homes throughout the land, was the first to write upon the education of her sex, was the author of many learned works and died, honored and lamented, in 1870, this book is reverently inscribed by

The Author.

PREFACE

THE following pages were written in the interest of the higher education of women. It is the sincere belief of the author that the method of coeducation, as realized in practice, has been brought to its logical conclusion. The commingling of the sexes on an educational basis was at one time a matter of education of the higher kind; but so energetically has the idea been forced into college life, and so deeply have thinking people been stirred by a discussion of its relative merits, or possible dangers, that it is now a problem in sociology. It has got beyond the grasp of the educator, who has heretofore claimed the right as such to decide upon its merits, and has passed into the hands

of those who, with a broader and deeper knowledge of human life, must give the verdict of its fitness and utility as a form of education.

The writer will never forget the picture of a woman who, in 1819, sought education under that wonderful educator, Emma Willard. This woman lived to the closing decade of the last century, and throughout that long life the culture there gained, and the inspiration to always seek the true and the beautiful, never left her. The high ideals acquired there sustained her throughout a life of self-denial and toil. Is not this the best that education can do to elevate and dignify the work that lies ready for willing hands, with hope blossoming perennially in a sane and healthy mind? A few more years will complete a century since this woman sought and found higher education at the Troy Female Seminary. Has coeducation anything to offer that will equal it in

results? Is it not the truth that higher education for women has fallen back a century in utility and fitness, if coeducation is to represent its best form?

This book is offered as a document to that great and discriminating public to whom must be referred all questions of public policy, and upon whose judgments coeducation must either stand or fall.

E. V. DE W.

WOMAN'S UNFITNESS FOR HIGHER COEDUCATION

CHAPTER I

The Commercial Element in Coeducation

The commercial character of coeducation, considered as a business enterprise, cannot be brought against the method as such. No public effort, it matters not how beneficent, but what has its business side, that must be wisely handled and fostered that the greatest good may accrue to the philanthropic enterprise. When it is

claimed that the idea of coeducation was gradually evolved from the necessities of the people, that it was a normal development that grew out of the social complex, more is claimed for the method than the facts justify.

Oberlin, where the two-sex college originated in 1833, was for forty years regarded as an eccentricity. The idea did not take root until it was followed in the order of events by the State Universities of Iowa and Wisconsin, endowed by the ancient Government reservation of 1787. The great grant of 1862 had but little effect on higher education, probably due to the disturbance of the Civil War, until in the early seventies the so-called colleges and universities of the West were started under the stimulus of the grant. From 1833 until 1870 there was no demand for the coeducational college. In the East, where colleges were endowed, or were aided by private gifts, no demand

for the college for both sexes existed at all. The conclusion is a fairly reasonable one, that the people of neither section was clamoring for the coeducational college. These colleges were not of normal growth, and were not the slow accretion of public sentiment in their favor. The method was not submitted to a careful test of fitness and expediency, but suddenly, by a general concurrence of feeling, rather than conviction, it sprang into existence throughout the West and the great American experiment was declared a success. On the strength of it, Doctor Dewey, in his Boston address, made the assertion that the West was a generation in advance of the East.

The motive force back of this was simply a grant of 10,000,000 acres of land rather than the needs of the people for coeducation.

It is not asserted that it is wrong to take advantage of this gift, as it was very

properly made to encourage education, but it was not made to promote the method of education that resulted. The purpose of the act of 1862 is expressed in the following preamble: "To teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." There was evidently no intent to found the present coeducational college with uncontrolled social relations as a coördinate department of the training. Young women had a right to share in the benefits of the grant. The attitude of the promoters of the two-sex plan said then, as they say now, if we give women separate colleges, or coördinate institutions, it will cost too much, hence the college for both sexes. There was money enough for both plans, but

not enough to found colleges and satisfy the greed of the political grafter. This sacred trust was bandied about between the upper millstone of political chicanery and the lower of ill-advised and amateur educators, without shame and without remorse, so far as known. Enough is known to warrant the assertion that if the secret history of that grant could be given in detail, after each State had received its due share, it would form one of the most disgraceful records in the political history of the West.

Has the West applied the proceeds of the liberal grant wisely? This is what President Jordan says about it in his *Popular Science Monthly* article: "It is true that untimely zeal of one sort or another has filled the West with a host of so-called colleges. It is true that most of these are weak and doing poor work in poor ways. It is true that most of these are coeducational. It is also true

that a great majority of their students are not of the college grade at all. In such schools low standards rule, both as to scholarship and as to manners. The student, fresh from the country, with no preparatory training, will bring the manners of his home. These are not always good manners as manners are judged." President Jordan ought to know what constitutes a good college, with an efficient faculty and effective equipment in libraries and laboratories, of which these alleged colleges have none. He ought also to be an excellent judge of what is implied by students of college grade, who fail to appear in the student body of these institutions. Commercialism cannot be carried further in educational enterprise. That the people who have been responsible for this ill-advised effort to realize upon an investment are not unconscious of their mistake, will appear from the following extract from Professor Slosson, of

the University of Wyoming: "The other charge, that economy was the dominant motive in establishing coeducation colleges, ought to be prohibited under the rules of the Geneva Convention, because it inflicts unnecessary suffering. It is not only false, but it hurts. Our fathers may have been mistaken when they founded coeducational colleges, but they were not stingy." Why could not Professor Slosson have been consistent as well as generous by conceding something to our fathers in Congress, who made Wyoming University possible in 1862, when, at that date, the paternal relation in Wyoming, if not unknown, had but little to do with coeducation. Business considerations have had more influence in founding the college for both sexes than any other factor. Numerous extracts could be made from the literature of the subject, proving that the segregation plan, while desirable, was too costly to maintain, as it would require

a duplicate equipment. The objection on this ground was carried so far as to allow young men and women to take the physical exercise together, as was the case at one time in Chicago University, where economy ought not to govern. To the rank coeducationist it has always been too costly to make coeducation wholesome and decent. The commercial spirit has been the ruling one in establishing colleges of this kind in the East. After the Legislature passed the enabling act, making Ann Arbor a two-sex college, the faculty objected to the expense caused by extra instructors to meet the demands of women students. The women of Michigan raised $100,000, and women were admitted. The same sum of money was given by women, mostly feminine suffragists, to purchase the admission of women to the Medical School of Johns Hopkins University. Half of this sum subsidized the University of Rochester, the raising of which, says

Mrs. Harper, nearly cost Miss Susan B. Anthony her life. Cornell University, after being liberally treated by a generous benefactor, condescended to admit women. The list could be extended further, but enough has been given to show that good business enterprise has underlaid the whole superstructure of coeducation. This is not written in a captious spirit. Money must be had to promote education and its growth. But it is stated in order to prove that coeducation in the offensive form, which is said to be its best expression, did not naturally grow out of the necessities and demands of the people. That the demand for it, and the money which purchased for it a place, came from the women who were exploiting the equal suffragist movement.

The standard of success of a college for both sexes is the realization on the investment. In other words, the size of the class. This measure of success is en-

dorsed by all who have approved the method. President Butler says: "From 1890 - 98 the number of men in coeducational colleges increased 70 per cent., while in separate colleges for men the number increased only 34.7 per cent." In the same paragraph he admits that among communities well to do, separate colleges for women are flourishing, "chiefly for social reasons." There are pecuniary reasons why the number of young men has increased in the mixed college over that in the men's colleges. The tuition fees in the former are nearly 100 per cent. less, while the annual living expenses, taken on an average, are 30 per cent. less. (Report Commissioner of Education, Washington, 1900, p. 1926.) Presidents Butler and Jordan, who are presumed to be fair men, take no notice of such an important factor of growth, but endeavor to lead the reader to believe that it is due to the general popular approval of the

method itself. Instead, the commercial spirit has induced the authorities of these institutions to offer the public a cheap article in the way of education. Ignoring governing conditions, as stated above, the coeducationists, with an air of boasting hardly credible in sober-minded people, call this progress, success, and higher education, based on large classes and cheap fees, and the matriculation of half-prepared boys and girls.

Against the abandonment of the coeducation method in favor of segregation or coördination, we have the trade spirit presenting itself in opposition. An ardent advocate of the method alludes to the fate that overtook Adelbert College, in Cleveland, Ohio. Fourteen years ago this department of the Western Reserve University segregated its classes. Of course, the result has been a commercial failure. "Adelbert College now rejoices in the magnificent number of 206 male students.

The Women's College has 222 students. Thus all this special and expensive double equipment is maintained, and necessarily at a lower standard for each, for two colleges of only 200 students apiece, with the sole purpose of preventing the girls from coming in competition with the boys in class-room work." This bold conclusion is given just after the writer had stated that both received the same degrees, and did the same laboratory work. (New York *Sun,* August 10, 1902.) If the claim of popular approval was justly predicated on sound reasoning, we might overlook indiscretions such as this, but when it is pointed out that the mixed college is coming nearer to a self-supporting stage than the college for a single sex, serious doubts arise whether it is education for trade purposes or for culture's sake. A college that hopes to support itself from students' fees, or one that strives to do so, ought to close its doors in the interests of humanity.

The cost is yearly growing more onerous. The laboratories, the libraries, the increasing corps of instructors and professors, make the tuition income of these institutions appear as nothing by the side of the aggregate expense. The true college spirit, that signifies serious work, that gives up all for culture and training, has so enlarged educational equipment, that the larger the attendance the greater the individual cost; while in the mixed college the larger the attendance the greater the profit. A singular feature of the cheap, badly equipped mixed college of the West, is the misuse of the word university. With resources only large enough to maintain a college of low rank for unprepared boys and girls, the university name is tacked on without any regard to what the word implies. The authorities of these institutions cannot possibly be ignorant of the scope and aim of a university, and they also must be conscious

of the fact that university rank is impossible to them. There must be a reason why this name is so generally misappropriated. Here also the trade spirit has left its finger-marks. A supposititious rank would appeal to the uneducated boys and girls from whom the classes are recruited. The people at large are ignorant of college or university organizations. It might safely be left to any farmer or mechanic, who has an ambition to have his boys and girls receive an education, if the name university did not have more educational significance than a mere college, and if he would not prefer the former to the latter. If, as a matter of fact, well known to the founders, an alleged university is no better than a college, has not the name been appropriated as a trade-mark in a business enterprise? The actual founders of the so-called colleges and universities of the West, the Congress of 1862, never intended, as the reader al-

ready knows, to found institutions to be known by such names. On the contrary, they were to be trade and agricultural schools, for the benefit of the "industrial classes." Legislatures of the States to which the grant was allotted had no power to act outside the terms of the grant, although they were given power to use their own discretion, but always within the limitations of the law of Congress. Under the conditions it is not an unwarranted conclusion that these institutions were created by a misappropriation of public money. Had they done better with it, the offence might be condoned, but with President Jordan's evidence as to the character of these institutions, it is painfully evident that irreparable wrong has been inflicted upon communities that were greatly in need of good education. When a commercial spirit invades educational matters, it is worse than politics. Of the two evils, it

is the lesser one to give up to the grafter a percentage on text-books, than to give up an entire system of what ought to be higher education to an abject spirit of trade. It may be objected that a body of men capable of uniting together as trustees and faculty of a college could not be guilty of so prostituting a sacred cause. When it is remembered that ten years ago scores of medical colleges were founded, which were purely private and business enterprises, enabled by acts of Legislatures to confer M. D. degrees, with faculties and boards of trustees always made up of the best men of the locality, and that these colleges were shams, it becomes less surprising to see the same spirit active in the creation of other institutions. It may have no special significance, but it was in the West that these inefficient trade medical colleges were more numerously exploited.

It is very noticeable that in coeduca-

tional colleges where the social line is strictly drawn, as in Rochester University, Middletown, and Cornell, there is a small attendance of women students. It is in the institutions where the social bars are let down that the large aggregation of young girls is to be found. It is to be hoped that the faculties of these institutions have ignorantly assumed the truth of the fiction that these immature and unsophisticated people can be safely given the social freedom of mature men and women. It is a charity to assume that the authorities of the mixed college, on such a basis, are not taking advantage of one of the inherent traits of young girls with a view of attracting large classes. One of the most alluring sides of a young woman's traits is her fondness for the society of the other sex. It is but natural that a college on the most liberal co-sex plan would attract the largest attendance of young women, not from any spirit of

wrong-doing, simply in compliance with a physiological law. If college authorities are not taking an unfair advantage of women, they are at least satisfied with the results financially. To satisfy the growing distrust of parents and guardians, they invent the ridiculous claim that such social freedom is in itself an education and a wise preparation of the young woman for her after-career. Young men are also attracted to these colleges for the same reason that women are, and, as is proudly pointed out, in rapidly increasing numbers. It cannot be denied that it is good business policy, the result of a liberal trade spirit. There is reason to hope for better things when it is remembered that in the space of ten years the number of trade medical colleges was decreased 75 per cent. as the result of public opinion.

Higher coeducation now means speed, not culture. It is the outcome of the intensifying nature of the national life,

which finds its most characteristic expression in the ruling commercial spirit. It may be a sad thing to say to those who reverence learning for its own sake, that the most typical form of this spirit is found in higher education. There is hardly a trace of it in primary and secondary education, unless it be in the more than liberal expenditure of money on the part of municipalities and States to educate the children and youths. This is an education for citizenship, and not for culture. It is in higher education that the dominant business animus rules both the methods and the results. It is made cheap, but price is nothing without speed. It is business with the same meaning that gives to the shipper a better freight rate from Omaha to New York than from Buffalo to New York. It is the long haul as against the short haul in education as in trade. Harvard University already allows its students to specialize in the direction of

professional work, and thus cut out a year from their liberal training. The senior year, during which so many young men learn to find themselves, counts for nothing if he can save one year out of eight in his total educational work. What Harvard does, many other colleges will do, also. How many students has this pet scheme of President Eliot's drawn away from other institutions? It is very likely that he was not conscious of it, but he was catering to the lowest form of the trade motive, as we know it, in education.

By viewing the extreme forms of coeducation as business enterprises, an explanation is furnished of many things that are difficult to understand. These institutions are, almost without exception, denominational in character and control. They stand for education as far as their means will allow, but they must exploit the tenets of the religious bodies that founded them. The central idea seems to be to educate

young men for the pastorate in these societies. This is well; it is too early in the twentieth century to separate religion and higher education. It is better to combine religion with the humanities, than not to have it at all. But it is religion at a price. Higher education must be animated by a simple purpose; it cannot be made to serve two masters, and to serve both with profit. Which pays the price will depend upon the proselyting energies of the religious founders. If they demand more of religion than they do of education, the latter is reduced to a minimum. It recalls to mind the affair of Vanderbilt University, where the professor of geology was made to resign on account of a little book which he had written, entitled "The Pre-Adamite Man." The trustees imagined that it differed slightly from the Mosaic account of the creation. This is not an extreme case. Professor Haeckel teaches at Jena because the clergy at Berlin would

interfere with his freedom of investigation and teaching. This is commonly called intolerance on the part of college faculties. It is good business practice not to antagonize any of the sectarian societies that the college may represent. That religion should be an agent to reduce a college from a purely educational status to a business enterprise, is a matter of serious regret, but when it goes further, and allows business considerations to dictate the method and kind of instruction, the freedom and liberality of education in denominational colleges are placed in jeopardy.

The independence that ensures the truth and liberality of education is less evident in the mixed college. Women are more passive in religious matters than men. It is doubtful if the action of the trustees at Vanderbilt University would have been tolerated in Eastern colleges for men by the student body. A coeducational college

could be handled much more easily in prompting the business interest of sectarianism than a college for men only. Colleges of this type have a double burden of commercialism, not the least of which is given to increasing the influence of the religious body which it represents. There will be no reform in this direction until the State takes charge of higher education, just as it has in primary instruction in behalf of all the people. Something may be said of the direct bearing of the trade spirit in lessening the opportunities of women for education in colleges for both sexes. Sound methods of instruction ought to allow women the benefit of professors of her own sex, if the eternal fitness of things is to be respected. Women stand on a higher plane than men do as instructors. In colleges for women they have proven their fitness as instructors. In the coeducation college she is given scant recognition. A tabulation of the sex

of professors in colleges and universities is almost barren of women. Taking Table 29 of the Report of the Bureau of Education at Washington for the years 1899 - 1900, at random among 46 colleges, 5 of which are for men, there are 600 men professors and instructors, and 57 women in like positions. This is the fairness shown to women on the part of men who do not hesitate to claim that their method is the only one that gives to women a privilege equal to men in education. There can be no question that the woman professor can get in closer touch with the young women students, both in sympathy and instruction, than the male professor. If there was a fair division of the chairs in colleges where there is an attendance of 500 to 1,200 women students, the gross social license that has disgraced many colleges could not have occurred. Women professors are not given a place in these colleges, for the reason that young men

would find the instruction of women professors irksome, and would leave for institutions where men professors are employed. It is good trade policy, which the authorities of these institutions would regard as hardship to defend. The question is a reasonable one, in view of the facts, does not coeducation cheapen the policy of the college in the matter of instructors? This cheapening of education is taking an unfair advantage of women, it is disposing of them at the least possible cost, and giving them the least possible opportunities, after bestowing upon them an alleged education of the higher kind. It would cost money to give young women professors whom the college could not make useful with men.

One more matter that concerns the commercial idea in the mixed college, is the gift of scholarships for women in colleges for both sexes. In Table 30 of the report referred to, and leaving out the

University of Chicago, the Northwestern University, and the University of Illinois, there are only 106 scholarships, for any of which women have no more rights than men. Women attend college with as many personal hardships as men, and with many less opportunities to earn money. Out of that scant number of scholarships, you can count upon the fingers of one hand those given in aid of women students. She is educated as cheaply, and given as little help as possible during her student life, denied all chance for position in her alma mater, and turned out upon the world as a sort of by-product in the education of men. She contributes 34 per cent. toward the total expense of the institution by her tuition, in return for which she receives an education of doubtful utility and uncertain culture, because it would cost too much money to give her more.

CHAPTER II

The Literature of Coeducation

We have only two criteria by which we may estimate the honesty of men, namely, by what they say, and by what they do. Simple as this standard is, by it we may often pierce to the *hinterland* of act and motive. Apply this measure to the public statement of those who are in favor of the education of the sexes in mixed colleges, we find a mass of so-called literature unique as emanating from men whom by courtesy we must call educated. It is of such a character that it forms a serious indictment of the sincerity of its authors. They seem to have made a fetich of coeducation, and, like a jungle priest,

fly into a rage when its right is questioned. A man who is sincere in his convictions, who believes that he is on secure ground, welcomes a discussion of his postulate. Not so the coeducationist. He is intolerant and abusive. He treats a serious social problem with levity, and with what he evidently believes to be wit. He forgets that this is not an age of intolerance, but that of free discussion. He is misplaced in the order of time, and is generations behind the spirit of free thought and interrogation that environ him; he repudiates the first, and resents the latter. He claims supremacy in deciding a great question of sociology. He tries to obliterate the laws of human life, and calls it progress. And yet, his aim is to secure the happiness and efficiency of an army of men and women, and he asserts his ability to do this by a common education in an atmosphere of the closest social relations. Touching this, his best claim to

respectability is the fact that he forgets. Humanity cannot be made happier by being ground down into a mass by the same machinery, neither can men and women be given the same point of view, the same interests, by social relations, however intimate, on the basis of a common education. The coeducationist forgets that men and women are at opposite poles in the ellipse of natural law, that they touch only on the periphery of thought and emotion, and that they are merely gyrating human atoms about the central pivot of sex, differentiated by laws of growth, maturity, and intellection that are growing stronger as our modern civilization gives individuality and intensity to life.

It would be amusing, if it were not disgusting, to give at length some of the many notable examples of irony and sarcasm, mixed with a peculiar form of wit as misplaced as hilarity at a funeral, flung

at the opponents of coeducation. A few examples must suffice. A first place in this style of argument must be given to President Butler, of Columbia University. In an article in *Collier's Weekly,* for June 2, 1902, "It would need the pen of Swift," he says, "to portray the absurdities of those who resist the movement to open wide to women opportunities for higher education." This quotation gives point to another method of impaling their adversaries on a point of false logic. If you are opposed to coeducation, you are opposed to the higher education of women. The ridiculous charge is at all times brought against those who only ask for sane methods in education, and for an even chance for woman as against man. It is manly and honorable, however, from their standpoint, to falsely charge a wrong motive to any one who opposes you. President Butler continues: "They are quite beyond Dooley's reach. One who is blessed

with a sense of humor, even in modest proportions, is unable to treat these arguments seriously." The narrow strip of States lying along the Atlantic seaboard "is about as provincial as Honduras." The ordinary relations between men and women he stigmatizes with rare judgment as "artificial and absurd." The only conceivable association with the other sex are those of love and marriage, "anything else is bad form, or distinctly suspicious; this seems to me utterly absurd, and that it is fraught with danger, every one knows." It would be better for President Butler to speak for himself, but it would have been still better, before writing this last sentence, to have consulted some good and wise female relative. What he says about society here is false, and one cannot resist the conviction that he knew it to be false, and invented it to point his argument. When he strikes a serious vein, it is to wave the whole matter of "solemn

arguments" against coeducation out of court with a high-handed flourish. "But really," he says, "these are all dead issues. The American people have settled the matter." This settlement is peculiar, and forms one of the conclusive arguments resorted to by all the friends of coeducation. "Fifteen millions of children in elementary schools are all being coeducated." Because we may practically say that all children attend primary schools and live at home, therefore the great American people have settled the fitness and utility of herding young men and women together in mixed colleges, where they live in unrestrained social relations, and which our diplomatic president says "is the family, the natural type." There is space for but one other selection from the effort of President Butler. After saying that higher education for women, apart from men, is disappointing, and stating with fine irony that his mind will be weakened

and his vitality sapped through teaching women, " he takes rank with the advocates of the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare's plays," concluding abruptly in a manner that, following the hilarity of the article, appears ludicrously solemn. " Meanwhile, it is very proper to remark in conclusion that the Columbia's plan of the separation of men and women during the undergraduate course, with equal opportunities for them, and a common opportunity in graduate work, meets admirably our social and industrial needs and conditions." This is not coeducation in any sense in which the word is used in this book, nor in any sense made use of by President Butler. In the light of the concluding paragraph, can any one understand why he wrote that article, and why he infused into it the tone and spirit that it shows? President Butler has been given more space than he was entitled to by the merits of his article, be-

cause he so completely epitomizes the stock arguments of all who favor the coeducational idea, and his style of presenting the subject is an excellent example of the method.

Another author who has contributed to the literature of the subject, is President Jordan, of Leland Stanford University. He aims to be learned and philosophical where President Butler was frivolous and jocular, but they stand in one respect upon common ground, as neither has the courage of his convictions. Several references have already been made to his *Popular Science Monthly* article, but he is called up here as a witness for the indictment brought against the advocates of what they are pleased to call the American idea. After a long statement of platitudes which were never disputed, he then draws a picture of a mythical college which is to meet the "varied needs of varied men," which is to be the future

college for both sexes in common. Where such a college is located he omits to inform us, but it is not the Stanford Junior University. On the whole, he talks in a very sane way on the modern college, and it is not until he touches upon the question at issue that he allows the prevailing flippant manner to intrude. "Shall women be taught in the same classes as men?" he asks, and answers that it "is a matter of *taste* or personal preference. It does no harm whatever to either men or women to meet those of the other sex in the same class-room. But if they prefer not to do so, let them do otherwise. No harm is done in either case, nor has the matter more then secondary importance." If coeducation can survive a blow like that it has a large amount of reserve vitality, but this appearance of indifference to the burning question that is agitating hundreds of colleges, real or putative, appears to result from his low opinion of educated

women. "She may know a good deal," he says, "but she can do nothing." If women are educated alone, the "tendency is toward beauty and order, while men have this obscured by the realities; but educated together, the women confer beauty and order upon the men, while the latter give beauty and fitness to the women. There is less of silliness and folly where man is not a novelty." Again he says, "that in coëducational institutions of high standards frivolous conduct or scandals of any form are rarely known," and yet on the very next page he tells us of the evils and scandals that result because women are not lodged in dormitories, but with fine distinction he states "that this is not to be charged to coeducation." He forgets that there is not a popular college for both sexes in the country that can give dormitory accommodation for but a small part of the women students. President Jordan's statements have

been freely quoted elsewhere, to which the reader is referred, but enough has been given to show the tendency toward rash assertion and indifference to facts, and the prevailing tone of flippancy that mars and weakens all that is said by the advocates of coeducation. All things considered, President Jordan has written the best paper upon the subject that has yet appeared.

There appeared in two recent numbers of the *Independent* an article by Mr. Henry T. Finck, on "Why Coeducation is Losing Ground." His position was fairly stated, his facts were unassailable, while its tone was moderate. It was highly proper that an article of this character should elicit a reply. This was made by Prof. E. E. Slosson, of the University of Wyoming, and appeared in the same number of the *Independent*. The reply was in the prevailing type. When he failed to give his argument validity by his

facts, he endeavored to give it vitality by his sarcasm. He began the discussion of such a serious subject in this way, and it is so very characteristic that it deserves to be given in full: "The most immoral act I ever committed, so far as known to the public, was to take a seat on the left of the aisle in an Eastern country church. It was the women's side. The reason I call it my most immoral act was not because of my motive, for I had none, but because nothing I have ever done before or since has caused such horror in the minds of the righteous, such sneers on the part of the ungodly, and such pain to my friends." As an opening for a paper upon a subject of vital importance, this stands unequalled for irrelevancy and unfitness. Its motive is evident, to heap ridicule upon the author who ventures to question the system of coeducation, while at the same time he could pose as a man of infinite wit among the applauding readers of Wyoming Uni-

versity. He is not satisfied to exhibit wit, but he must also indulge in paradoxes, if we may so mildly designate a denial of physiological truths, as well as the conclusions of experience. Segregation of the sexes in coeducation heightens sex consciousness and "stimulates the sex idea." Colleges for men are called monastic institutions, and he makes no charges about the morals of the men there, because he "knows too much about them." It is not necessary to treat Professor Slosson seriously, and, like the others, whom we have so far quoted, it is brought forward only to show the animus displayed by the coeducationists.

The most intolerant and vituperative reply brought out by Mr. Finck's article was from the one who is not an educator, Mrs. Harper, who edits, or writes, a column or two in the Sunday edition of the New York *Sun*. Her reply is not worth quoting, as it contains no argument

against Mr. Finck's contention, but is made up of abuse of all who oppose the mixed college, and of that author in particular, who was roundly abused for a couple of books he had written, and which appeared especially to rouse her ire. If there is any truth or justice in the theory of coeducation, it can never be brought out by the methods of argument followed by its adherents. Let them eliminate the tendency to rash assertion of facts of which they offer no proof, let them once for all come to the modest conclusion that their mere opinion has no value in an argument upon a question of sociology, and exhibit the manners of gentlemen, and there may be hope that the truth will be reached. When you are contending with men who use their style of argument, the only way is to turn against them their own weapons. This want of tolerance savors of mediævalism, and crops out in the most unexpected places. Surely the

discussion held by the Association of Colleges of the Middle States, published in the Regents' Report for 1901, must have had something in it worthy of serious consideration, and yet Dean Smalley, of Syracuse University, an able and conscientious educator, says that it had " some nonsense on coeducation." As long as the subject is treated in this way, it will provoke hostile discussion. There is not a man who has approached the subject from the opposite point of view who has not been actuated by a spirit of fairness, and the sole desire to seek the truth. This frivolous attitude of its defenders, the jeering, scandalizing comments of the press, have deprived coeducation of all dignity. It appears like education in burlesque, a comedy of errors, with the actors dressed in cap and gown.

It is difficult to keep the advocates of coeducation in colleges for men and women down to the main question. Co-

education is always traced to the primary school, then to the secondary school, and finally to the college. No writer who has ever opposed the latter form of coeducation had an idea of offering any argument against children being taught together in primary schools. In the secondary schools, in which the student averages the age of fifteen years, hardly any objection can be raised, although in quite a number of cities, especially in the South, they are separated. In the primary school the sex problem, of course, never obtrudes. Among the older students in secondary schools, if the boys and girls were given the same uncontrolled social privileges that they have in mixed colleges, the same irregularities would exist. The boys and girls are, however, under home influences and control. This it is that keeps the school wholesome and free from moral contamination, and it is the absence of the home control that forms the storm cen-

tre in large mixed colleges, and that caused the revolution in the relation of the faculty to the women students in Syracuse University.

In the report of the Commissioner of Education for the United States for 1901 - 02, there is an extensive chapter devoted to coeducation. It certainly needed editing by the official compiler. In Boston a special committee made a divided report on coeducation. The majority report, signed by J. P. C. Winship and Emily A. Fifield, offers some remarkable instances of logic. We do no injustice to the authors in separating the following extracts from their context. "A man tells a rough story in a smoking-car because "there are no women here," therefore, educate boys and men with girls and women, and the refining influence represses and subdues the rough and gross nature in young men. We wonder if that is so. The low estimate that coeducationists place upon our young

men exists to such an extent that it forms a feature of its so-called literature. How they account for the existence of the American gentleman, young or old, before coeducation was ever dreamed of, is a minor matter not deserving of explanation. "If it is right," says this extraordinary report, "for brothers and sisters to live in the same house and eat at the same table, then it is right for them to be educated together. Let them be brought up separately, and if they meet only clandestinely, great harm is likely to result." Surely the reader will pardon the question, where did this man and woman get their experience of life? But the worst is yet to come. "If wedlock is right and proper, then coeducation is right and proper. If men and women are to marry, they should know each other summer and winter before marriage, and the more they know of each other the less likely will divorce result." One other extract, in

order to show the high-handed style of treating all who oppose the method, by people who have become case-hardened to the coeducational idea. The majority made an enrolment of all teachers for and against attendance in mixed schools. Of the results of this tabulation, they say: "Of the 254 teachers opposed to coeducation, 122 are teachers of girls alone, and 109 instructors of boys only. They may be considered *ex parte* in their views, and should be ruled out." We will say nothing about the peculiar grammar of this quotation, and only call attention to the result: as all who voted in opposition did so in obedience to their convictions, their vote was recommended for rejection; the result of the voting, therefore, was unanimously in favor. As the minority report is evidently "*ex parte*," we rule it out.

A considerable number of excerpts from the reports of foreign teachers, delegates to the Chicago Educational

Congress in 1893, are given in the United States report. — Leaving out all references to common and secondary schools, one of these reports, being from a lady, Mlle. Marie Dugard, is well worth quoting in part. "From the moral standpoint, the consequences are still more dangerous. It is a law that if two individuals live together, the one who has the strongest personality becomes the model of the other. Finally, it is impossible that between young men and young women, associated every day in the familiarity of classes, there should not be formed some romances, which the American education, it is true, renders inoffensive so far as regard manners, but which will nevertheless have disadvantages. These objections seem judicious, and in the light of them it seems that coeducation ought to be abandoned." Prof. Emil Hausknecht, of Berlin, says in the same report: "As a makeshift, coeducation is better than noth-

ing — as a principle, it entirely ignores the needs of the separate sexes." In his book entitled "American Traits," Prof. Hugo Munsterberg, in a summary which is especially fair and reserved, writes of the effemination of college training. "The whole situation here militates against the home and against the masculine of higher education, and seems to me, therefore, antagonistic to the health of the nation. . . . Coeducation means only equality; but the so-called higher education for girls means, under the conditions of American life to-day, decidedly not the equality, but the superiority of women. . . . The woman who studies medicine or natural science, music or painting, perhaps even law or divinity, can we affront her with the suggestion, which would be an insult to the man, that all her work is so superficial that she will not care for its continuation as soon as she undertakes the duties of a married woman? Or ought

we to imply that she is so conceited as to believe that she is able to do what no man would dare hope for himself; that is, to combine the professional duties of the man with the not less complex duties of the woman? She knows that the intensity of her special interest must suffer, and that her work must become a superficial side interest."

In the further examination of the report of the Bureau of Education at Washington, which, by the way, is a coeducational document, rather unfair measures are resorted to to prop up the cause. The boast is frequently made that the American idea is spreading to foreign universities and colleges; concerning this, the report states: "At Oxford, women are admitted to the lectures of about 120 professors, readers, and lecturers in the university. They are also admitted to the examinations for B. A., but are not eligible to the university degrees. Substantially the same arrange-

ments have been made at Cambridge. Women are admitted on the same terms as men to Durham University, and are eligible to all the degrees excepting those in divinity. Victoria University grants degrees on the same terms as men. In the University of Wales, women have the same privileges as men. The University College, established in England since 1868, is open to men and women. By the Universities Act of 1889, the Scotch universities were authorized to open their doors to women. Edinburg admits them to the classes with men. Glasgow has affiliated Queen Margaret College for women, and, more recently (1895), opened all lectures in the faculty of arts to women. The University of Dundee, affiliated to St. Andrew's, is coeducational. Women are admitted to all the privileges of the Royal University of Ireland. Trinity College, Dublin, does not admit women, but special examinations for women out-

side the course for students of the college were established about twenty-five years ago, and are still continued." The contention of this extract is manifest, that is, that coeducation, as we understand the term in the United States, is finding a foothold in conservative England, and is intentionally misleading. Coeducation, with its untrammelled social relation of the sexes, as exists in Northwestern and Chicago University, and as it formerly existed at Syracuse, could not live an hour in England. As a matter of fact, coeducation on the Oberlin plan has made no progress in England, or the Colonies. In England, University College has a woman's department, King's College also has a woman's department, Lady Margaret, Somerville, and St. Hilda, at Oxford, are for women. In Wales, there are Alexandria Hall, at Aberystwyth, and Aberdere Hall, at Cardiff, as distinct from the parent institution as are Rad-

cliffe, at Harvard, and Barnard, at Columbia. Glasgow has affiliated Queen Margaret College for women, and is not coeducational. In Germany, the college as it is known here does not exist, its function being confined to the gymnasia, to which women are not admitted. German universities confine their degree work to the learned profession, law, medicine, divinity, and to a course of philosophy. The Technische Hochschules are coördinate in rank with the universities, and give practical professional training, except in the learned professions. Women are admitted to examinations for degrees in many of the universities, but are not allowed to matriculate, and are simply hearers by courtesy. They thus form no part of the student body. In France, the prevailing conditions are but little better in favor of women, their university no better. In 1898 there were 871 women enrolled as attending French universities, in

a total of 28,782. In medicine there were 469, science 80, letters 262, and in pharmacy 55. For the same year (1898) there were only 16 doctorates in medicine and 3 diplomas in pharmacy bestowed. In spite of all this, in nearly every article that is written the statement is made that coeducation is making rapid progress abroad, and the public which they address believes it.

An interesting feature of the more recent literature of coeducation, is the plan of segregate, or coördinate, education. These are advocated as a remedy for the evils that the system has gradually led up to. Both are as strenuously battled against as is the plan to abolish the method entirely. President C. F. Thwing, in his book, "The College Woman," extracts from which are given place in the report of the Bureau, "Coördination," he says, "represents a college for men as part of a university, and a college for women as

part of a university, each able to exist without the other, both united in loyalty to the same ideals. Coördinate education is not coeducation, for the men and women do not recite in the same class. It promotes a very sane health. It does not tempt to love giving or love receiving any more than humanity itself. It is a method more easy to administer than coeducation. The students are not brought into relations so intimate that even the wisest parents can ask questions of anxiety." It is an anomaly in education that the sex relation referred to by President Thwing is just what the hard-shell coeducationist does want. The humanizing, cultivating influence of the "cultured" young girl of eighteen on the education of men cannot be given up. She is an essential feature of the method. In this "cultured" society too great intimacy cannot exist, and, if marriage takes place, and the more the better, as President Jordan says, what can

be so good as a cultured young man, whom we may term the by-product of the method?

Brown University has begun the method of coördinate education, and is counted by Doctor Harris, in his Bureau report, as a coeducational college, which called forth a protest from President Faunce. The work at Brown does away with one objection raised against the coördinate system, namely, its expense. "While this establishment," the president says, "makes no drain whatever upon the University's financial resources, it adds greatly to its popularity and favor with the community." Coördination, when established as a part of a college for men, elicits no protest on the part of coeducation advocates, but when it is proposed to introduce it into institutions for both sexes, where the "culture" theory has hitherto flourished, it rouses a storm of indignant protest.

The same may be said of the proposed

segregation plan for Chicago University, an idea which has taken root also in Northwestern University, according to recent despatches of the Associated Press. These changes in the two great institutions of the Middle West may be regarded as sanitary measures to improve education and clear the moral atmosphere, as clearly needed in college life as in an effort to abate the smoke nuisance in Chicago. Against this, newspaper attacks are made, of a character only equalled by the slum politics. The reader already knows something of the aim of coördination in education. Is there anything about it to solicit the following intemperate attack from Mrs. Harper, in the easy columns of the New York *Sun?* "Is the sex line to be drawn at Chicago University? After ten years of enjoyment of its splendid privileges, are women to be set aside in an 'annex,' and subjected to all the limitations which are endured by the women of

other colleges where coördinate education prevails? These are the things which the people of this country have a right to protest. Has Doctor Harper hypnotized Mr. Rockefeller, that he consents to this? . . . One of the greatest experiments ever made has been in progress at Chicago University, and it has been watched by the educators of the world. President Harper proposes to declare this practically a failure. Such action will be a calamity from which it will require a generation to recover. There should be a quick and unanimous protest from every newspaper and every man and every woman of influence." (New York *Sun,* July 6, 1902.) The concluding sentence of this quotation demonstrates that Mrs. Harper lacks sanity on this subject. All people must think as she does. All newspapers do not advocate coeducation, and most men and women of influence send their daughters to colleges for women. Again she says: "It is

sought to do this unjust thing, not by presenting openly the objection to the present system, and permitting a full and free discussion, but by the party machine method of coercing voters, juggling ballots, taking advantage of absentees, to secure majorities, and other devious ways of the politician." This would be very wrong if it were true, but it is not true. Again, she winds up with the crescendo: "Against this most retrogressive action let there be emphatic protest by the press, by individuals, and by organizations of men and women throughout the country." (New York *Sun,* September 28, 1902.) If there can be anything finer than this in the way of a quiet, philosophical discussion of a great problem in education, research has failed to discover it.

The most aggressive advocates are the women suffragists. This movement has been the fostering agent of the corelation of the sexes in college education. This, at

least, is true of the method in the East. In the West and Middle West, peculiar social conditions favored the growth of the idea. In the East, the plan of campaign on the part of the suffragists has been a stupid abuse of men; on a parity, their method of advancing the cause of coeducation has been an equal abuse of any one who opposed it. The motive of the women suffragists, admitting that they have any, must be a mixed one. On the one hand, they hope to gain an additional political asset with which to discount the future, and, on the other hand, to make a marked impression by the alleged excessive brightness and receptive qualities of women over men in their studies. The latter is no doubt true, as relates to young woman from eighteen to twenty-two years of age, but this disappears as maturity places men and women on a common level. Industrial feminism has received but little attention from the suf-

fragists, who have concentrated on the woman student, and only on the student as she takes part in a mixed college, the interest that ought to have been extended to women in the many relations of importance which she bears to the great modern movement of industrial feminism. Here she is gaining her greatest victories in the wide domain of the industries, and gains them with modest assurance, in which coeducation and woman's suffrage take no part. This, the future will show to be true coeducation; in the ever widening university of practical life, where skill of hand and the trained mind will make woman man's coworker, share and share alike, coeducation must open the door to woman. It must make easy and ensure success for her in what is difficult for the sister who is not coeducated. But coeducation has not yet stood this test. There is an entire absence of evidence to prove that, in the active competition of life, young women,

the product of mixed colleges, have any advantage over other women. The coeducationists make no claim in this direction; there are too many facts against it viewed from this standpoint. The only claims the women suffragists make, are that women are entitled to the same kind and degree of education that men are receiving, without reference to occupation, and that education of the coeducational kind will better fit her for the duties of a wife and mother. Concerning this latter contention, there are no facts obtainable from the vast army of wives and mothers. That, however, is of no consequence; it is stated with the force of a self-evident proposition, in which all are to place their belief. If there is anything in the license permitted in the uncontrolled relations of the sexes to fit a woman for wifehood, the history of these young women has failed to reveal it, or, if to bring to the side of the cradle an intelligence trained on this model offers any

advantages over instinctive motherhood, it also has yet to be proven.

The relation of women to the industries is not indebted to college education; on the contrary, the great common school system of the country, which, during the past fifty years, has been given broader scope and a more practical direction, is what has opened the door to industrial feminism in America, as contrasted with the social feminism of Germany, with Madame Husson as its exponent. In England, where it is a gospel of discontent, or in Sweden, where Ibsen is its prophet. This is called the "emancipation of women," and this is the ground held by the women suffragists. There is no word as to the betterment of woman labor conditions. On the contrary, she is simply regarded individually as a political unit, from whom her natural prerogatives have been withheld. "And all women will know in time," says an illogical advocate of "equal

rights," " what many of them realize now, that their Government has not fulfilled its whole duty in simply permitting them to make a living." When did Government, State or national, ever assume any right to " permit " women to make a living? Absurdities like this must not be allowed to interrupt the even flow of the remarkable argument; " but that justice demands," she continues, " that it should give them, in addition, a voice in the councils and a part in its administrations. The State itself will eventually have sufficient confidence in the judgment, ability, and patriotism of its women to acknowledge fully their value and their necessity in public affairs." (New York *Sun,* July 5, 1903.) This social feminism, the gospel of decadence, that is disturbing Europe and filling it with a literature of revolt and discontent, is not that woman may find wider fields for her industrial efforts, but for her to throw off the shackles of social

restraints, and secure in their place her emancipation from marriage and all that it implies. If coeducation is not to secure for women a broader field of usefulness, then, under the decadent teaching of the women suffragists, she will be expected to join in the cry of revolt against the crime of marriage and maternity without her consent.

The future for women, the healthy, contented future, all depends on the material side, that inevitably tends to release woman from her dependence on man. This must not only be relative, but it must be absolute and general, in order to give her a freedom of choice as to what her relations with man may be. If she be self-supporting and contented with her lot, she marries from choice, with no necessity to wait for a possible marriage which may never come. She will be under no necessity to become a place-hunter from a political majority, which, unless women

possess a moral fibre to which men are strangers, will make of her a social impossibility. What is there in coeducation to impart to woman her ability to keep her future in her own hands? That is to broaden, not her capacity to vote and to seek office, but to secure for her a fair share of the right and ability to work. That is to increase her effectiveness by the side of man that alone will secure to her an equal share of compensation.

To the great and final test of coeducation in mixed colleges, that of fitness for work, the literature of the subject gives no clue. Unsupported assertions are made, but no proof given. It would naturally occur to one that, if the advocates of the method believe it to be necessary to say what they do, and in a way which they evidently regard as striking and convincing, they would also see the need of offering some evidence that would bring conviction to thinking people.

It would be a simple matter to keep in touch with their women graduates, and tabulate their occupations and earning capacities. The majority of women graduates of mixed colleges who have to seek a vocation enter the teaching profession. A contributor to the New York *Sun* of January 11,1903, Mrs. Harper, is wholly just in her complaint of the small salaries paid to women teachers. But the explanation is not that they are discriminated against, it is simply the old law of supply and demand. The statistics given in the Report of the Federal Bureau of Education show that the average excess of women teachers over men is 72 per cent. for the whole country. The average pay for men is $47, and $39 for women, monthly. An average never expresses a mathematical fact, it is only an approximation, and, as such, gives no idea of the actual salaries paid. In the cities of what in the report is called the North Atlantic Division, it is

doubtful if there are one per cent. of men on the eligible lists seeking positions in the grammar schools. On the eligible list of the city of Syracuse, there are more than enough seeking positions to supply the city for ten years, and no men applying for appointment as room teachers. Women graduates from the local coeducational college have crowded the lists for high school positions to an equal extent. These young women refuse positions in schools of the senior grade. It is only partly a matter of pay, as the majority claim that their college education has fitted them for something higher than to teach children. If their higher education is responsible for the belief that they are too well educated to teach children, their college has badly fitted them for their calling. Indeed, so risky is the experiment of appointing a recent graduate to a high school position, that Doctor Blodgett, the very efficient Superintendent of Schools of

Syracuse, has repeatedly protested against such appointments. Competition is rapidly placing the teacher of college rank on the same basis as the graduates of the normal schools and teachers' training classes.

In all the literature that has emanated from the coeducationists, there has been nothing said about the college coeducated girl at home. She must, for a certain period of her life, resume her place in the home environment, with the exception of those who teach, or the small number who enter the professions. What atmosphere does she bring with her, what return does she make for the family resources often strained to fit her for something useful? Elenor Hoyt, in *Collier's Weekly* for June 21, 1903, writes evidently in the fulness of knowledge of this interesting phase of the coeducated college woman. "The college girl from the small town finds it impossible 'to settle down and stagnate.' Something is wrong with an

education that does not provide a woman with resources to defy stagnation. The daughter cannot relieve her mother of long-carried domestic and social responsibilities, because these petty intrusions upon her time interfere with her self-culture. The college girl must carry the gospel of plaster casts and foreign photographs to the great unwashed, even if that work takes strength and energy, and, consequently, good cheer." There are fortunately many exceptions to this dark picture, otherwise coeducation as a home wrecker would exceed in force a Western cyclone; but, in theory, that is just what the system might be expected to do for a shallow, conceited girl. It is, as President Jordan wisely says, that some girls are not fit to be coeducated at a college.

CHAPTER III

The Physiology of Coeducation

One of the strongest arguments that the advocates of coeducation offer in favor of their system, is the improved health, physically and mentally, of the women students. This claim is made so assiduously as to lead one to believe that a similar condition does not exist among women at large, but that it is a distinguishing trait of the college woman. If the reader will bear in mind what has been said concerning the social life in colleges for both sexes, it will need no argument to establish the fact that there is nothing, either in the curriculum or in the social habits of the students, to maintain good

health in those who are well, or to enable those who are constitutionally delicate to cope successfully with the four years of student life. She is admitted on the same physical standard that men are, and she continues on that basis throughout her course. The central idea of coeducation is the obliteration of the sex line. The moment woman is held as something different from man in needs and capacity for education, or that she offers any physical limitations to its attainment, coeducation as a system in higher education will break down, and its most bigoted advocate can no longer claim any place or necessity for it. Any contention that women students show a continued improvement in health and physique during their college course has no better basis in fact, or in reason, than many other claims upheld by the advocates of the system.

What they make a point of is true of all young women who have a fair start

in the way of functional health, as they mature in four years of advancing womanhood, without regard to their station or occupation in life.

This clears the way for an impartial inquiry into the subject of coeducation and women's health. In the interest of fairness, it may be said that many who have opposed it have made their specifications of the ill-effects of coeducation upon the health of women students too broad. It is not so much a matter of the greater liability of a physical breakdown during the pursuit of student life, in excess of other occupations of women, as it is of whether there are efficient functional reasons why women may not conform to the standard of men in the manner and method of study. And, further, if such conformity is enforced in colleges for both sexes, is her future health as well assured as it would have been had she been educated along lines where due regard was

given both to education and to womanhood?

Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, in her book on "The Question of Rest for Women," is obliged to reluctantly confess that forty-five per cent. of women suffer from menstrual pain. The experience of every physician who has opportunities for observation confirms this. Experience also shows that twenty per cent. of other women suffer from mental depression, lassitude, loss of appetite, and a general sense of physical ill. Here sixty-five per cent. of women offer a material reason why some modification should be made in her manner of study. Dr. Putnam Jacobi, in her experimental study of this function, shows that there is a marked increase of arterial blood-pressure just before, with an abrupt fall after its completion. There is also, during this function, an enormous increase of nerve waste, as shown by the increase in the excretion of urea in some

cases, and in other cases, while the systemic demands for its excretion exist equally in both cases, there is a marked failure of elimination. Here an actual poison is retained in the system, concentrating in action on the gray matter of the brain frontal lobes. These women could labor with much less damage to their nerve centres over the wash-tub, than they could solve their problems in geometry, or construe their Latin prose. In view of these profound alterations in circulation and nutrition, to demand of women the same hours and continuity of work that men give to college work, is a physiological insult. To quote further from Dr. Putnam Jacobi, who is a staunch defender of the ability of her sex to do all manner of work at all times: "For theoretical reasons, exposed in detail, and from the results of observation, we are authorized in asserting that women do work better, and with much greater safety to health, when their work

is frequently intermitted, but that these intermittences should be at short intervals and lasting a short time, not at long intervals and lasting longer." She makes what we may term a solemn conclusion in the last paragraph of her brilliant book: "It remains true, however, that in our existing social conditions, forty-six per cent. of women suffer more or less at menstruation, and, for a large number of these, when engaged in industrial pursuits, or others, under the command of an employer, humanity dictates that rest from work during the period of pain be afforded whenever practicable." If to those who suffer from actual physical pain is added twenty per cent. of others who suffer from the psychic disturbance of menstruation, we have a vast number of young women in our two-sex colleges who are treated with brutal inhumanity and indifference, for have we not the evidence of numerous defenders of coeduca-

tion that no difference is observed in the work of college girls during this period, and no complaints are made. That no complaints are made is probably true, for any one who has studied girls knows very well that, when continually working in the presence of the other sex, they will suffer actual torture rather than betray the cause of their weakness.

But Dr. Putnam Jacobi goes deeper into the cause of women's temperamental need for rest than the superficial one of menstruation. She concludes: "Finally, that they (intervals of rest) are required at all times, and have no special reference to the period of the menstrual flow." This, as our author states, is because women do work better and with less possible injury to health, when these short, but frequent, intervals of rest are observed.

Now, no author the equal to Dr. Putnam Jacobi in general professional learning, or in special knowledge of her sex,

connected with any college for both sexes, has given this physiological side of coeducation any other attention than a general denial. In a flat contradiction, which, in most cases, is a summary of their ignorance upon the subject, they appear to have disposed of the whole question to their own satisfaction. Coeducation is being tried before the bar of a public that is gradually becoming enlightened, and this question will have to be answered by arguments more valid than sneers and meaningless denials.

Brilliant as is the work of Dr. Putnam Jacobi upon this important phase of coeducation, we have a more recent contribution, based upon a wider range of data and bearing directly upon the subject of education. In the transactions of the American Gynecological Society for the year 1900, Dr. George J. Engelmann, the then president of the society, contributed a paper on "The American Girl of

To-day. The Influence of Modern Education on Functional Development." It may be said here that if coeducationists ignore this work of Doctor Engelmann, they will do so to their lasting regret. Space forbids doing more here than giving a few extracts from this paper. In Table III., one hundred college women are tabulated, of whom ninety per cent. were sufferers before entering, and ninety-five per cent. during college life. The ratios are high, as the author included moderate sufferers. He says: "We have seen an aggravation of suffering with advancing grade, as much as ten per cent.; and yet more in normal than in high, more in college than in high or preparatory school. The college alumnæ, by their records, show sixty-six per cent. during the earlier years of pubertal development, and state that organic trouble increased during college from twenty-four to thirty-six per cent. A certain confirma-

tion of these figures is, moreover, found in the experience of young women as to the increased difficulty of work, mental or physical, during the menstrual period, and by the number who are excused from their regular duties at those times. We find this expression precisely where we should naturally expect it, where study is harder, and looked upon more seriously."

In speaking of the pre-menstrual and post-menstrual waves of nervous excitation and blood-pressure, he says: "Intellectual vigor follows the same lines, and mental energy and acumen are, as a rule, diminished during the first days, at least, as is affirmed by perhaps sixty-five per cent. of the many questioned, who state, that mental exertion, study, at that time, is more difficult and wearing, and requires greater effort. This mental depression is evident in the listlessness, indifference, and inability to master tasks easy at other times, noted by every observant educator

as indicating the presence of the flow and the period of its first advent, and the brightest mind, the most sensitive, high-strung, nervous organization is, as a rule, the most responsive and most liable to impairment during the menstrual period."

Our author continues, with another and most important résumé: "Functional disturbances are least in the first years of pubertal development in the high school, increasing with each year, increasing in the normal school and college, increasing with intensity and seriousness of work; in one institution we see an aggravation of from sixty-four to seventy per cent. in the freshman class, and to eighty per cent. in the higher classes. This is not the effect of brain-work alone, but of all the conditions, mental and physical, of school life, the resultant of concomitant circumstances, as is shown by the widely different conditions in various institutions, but the dependence upon school life is distinctly characterized

by increase of suffering, more frequent recurrence from eighteen to twenty-five and even as often as once in fourteen days, toward the latter part of the school year, with return to the normal in vacation, usually recurring with the resumption of fall work, but certainly with the tire which comes toward the close of the session in spring. This deterioration in health, general and functional, in the college girl, is not the natural accompaniment of increasing years, as is proven by a comparison of her condition with that of the working girl. It is distinctly a sequence to college life, directly and indirectly, not due altogether to mental strain, but to the combined influences of life and methods of training. This comparison is instructive, though unjust to the working girl, and I refer to it because it has been made to show that the influences of school and college life are no more deleterious to the peculiar organization of women than those

to be encountered in other occupations in the active pursuits of life. It is unjust, because the sole aim and object of the one is the development of all the powers and faculties, guided by instructors whose duty it is to perfect this development, and correct faults physical as well as mental. The other is engaged in the struggle for existence, and in the keen competition of the day must expect wounds, however the humanitarian may seek to guard her."

Taken from the report of the committee of Association of College Alumnæ for 1855 on the Health of Women College Graduates, Doctor Engelmann shows sixty-six per cent. with menstrual irregularities, as compared with fifty-three per cent. during the earlier years of pubertal development, and states that organic trouble increased during college life from twenty-four to thirty-six per cent. In conclusion, Doctor Engelmann says: "To the educator I would

say that heed must be given the instability and susceptibility of the girl during the functional waves which permeate her entire being; that emotional stimulation must be avoided, and decided concessions must be made to the depression, physical and psychical, the lessened inhibition, and physiological control during the fluctuations of menstruation." Our author calls attention to the sex trait already alluded to, and which explains why so many college instructors for both sexes insist that women students make no complaints and show no impairment in work, due to functional causes. The author says: "The number and intelligence of those examined are such that we must accept the data, and accept, too, the fact that unfavorable conditions, that suffering irregularity, and impediment to work, are never thoroughly revealed; they are always likely to be below the true mark by reason of the inherent unwillingness of women to admit

imperfections of this nature." This instinctive reticence concerning the functional life must be greatly intensified in mixed colleges, in which, if a woman student were periodically absent from class work, she would, in her exaggerated state of self-consciousness, believe that the eyes of every man student there were upon her, with a full understanding of the reason. Many college women, who have consulted me professionally concerning their health, have stated this fact as a positive reason why they cannot lighten their work, and that all whom they knew, who were functional sufferers, felt the same about it. If we could get the secret history of these women, it would reveal a degree of physical courage to work under difficulties, and a heroism in suppressing emotions, that would call forth our tenderest sympathy and highest admiration. One other matter in the functional disturbance of women during educational life requires

a brief notice, especially as it is touched upon but lightly in any discussion of this subject. The evidence upon functional pain and excess is ample, but, as showing the profound nervous inhibition, and the important fact that the pelvic organs always become the storm centre, the total arrest of function is important. This arrest is purely emotional, and is so common in educational institutions, that it has received a distinctive name, the French calling it "Amenorrhea des pensionat." Instances of it have occurred in the same student at the opening of every college year. Its average duration is three months. It resists all the usual treatment of such a condition, and terminates spontaneously. Meanwhile, the student is not capable of her best work, is languid and pale, with indigestion and insomnia.

Coeducation has nothing to do with its causation, but, as contravening the stock argument of the coeducationists that

women have no functional traits that would conflict with the routine of study followed by men, it is conclusive evidence to the contrary. The last word that can define this difference has been spoken by Dr. Putnam Jacobi; she says: "Our observations should show that in all these respects the intermenstrual, and especially the premenstrual, periods, represent a pregnancy in miniature." Could sex differentiation, that has any possible bearing upon the question of women observing the routine of study prescribed for men, have a more reaching effect than this?

To quote Dr. Edward H. Clark, in his "Sex in Education," and I do so with all the more pleasure from the fact that his little book was the first to focus public attention upon the fact that, while education had the same meaning and end for women as for men, it had wide physiological differences in its method. His book appeared in 1874, when coeducation

was first beginning to assume its aggressive form, and anything in opposition was sure to be roundly abused.

Few books ever were more virulently assailed. He roused a campaign of abuse, the sure indication of a weak cause, and among the multitude of replies not one refuted a single fact stated by Doctor Clark. "They may study," he says, "the same books, and attain equal results, but should not follow the same methods. Mary can master Virgil and Euclid as well as George; but both will be dwarfed, — defrauded of their rightful attainments, — if both are confined to the same methods. It is said that Elena Cornaro, the accomplished professor of six languages, whose statue adorns and honors Padua, was educated like a boy. This means that she was initiated into, and mastered, the studies that were considered to be the peculiar dower of men. It does not mean that her life was a man's life,

her way of study a man's way of study, or that, in acquiring six languages, she ignored her own organization. Women who choose to do so can master the humanities and the mathematics, encounter the labor of the law and the pulpit, endure the hardness of physics, and the conflicts of politics; but they must do it all in woman's way, not in man's way. In all their work they must respect their organization and remain women, not strive to be men, or they will ignominiously fail. For both sexes, there is no exception to the law that their greatest power and largest attainment lie in the perfect development of their organization. Wherein they are men, they should be educated as men; wherein they are women, they should be educated as women. The physiological motto is, educate a man for manhood, a woman for womanhood, both for humanity. In this lies the hope of the race." It must not be the conclusion of the reader

from the foregoing that these limitations are confined to the college girl. The girl in the counting-room and store, or factory, labors under the same functional disadvantages. With the latter, however, it is less trying to keep a fair average of physical work than it is for the college girl to keep on an effectual level with men in purely intellectual work. The working girl has the advantage of a sturdier physique, while the woman student is a product of the schools all through her life, and has developed the intellectual at the expense of the physical side of her organization. She has in that degree increased the zone that is responsive to physical suffering, and without the hardened fibre of nerve and muscle that enables her to endure. Women enter college only half prepared — she is perfect in her prescribed studies, but her physical training has been entirely neglected. In nearly all secondary schools, no attention is paid to physical education

of girls. The boys fare better, not because they receive any more attention along these lines, but in the high schools the boy is at an age when athletics appeal to him, and voluntary sporting clubs keep him in good training. Simply to show how this essential to education is neglected in secondary schools, it is only necessary to mention the instance of Syracuse, New York, in which city a high school was erected at a cost of $400,000, without a gymnasium, or a place in the building in which one could be installed. The college girl does her first gymnasium work after she enters college. Coming into her life at a period when nutrition is centring upon function, which is only on the threshold of maturity, it is difficult to divert this nutrition in the direction of muscular development. The gymnasium work of the young men is carried on for a different object than that of young women. Outside athletics is what he is

working for, and compared to which the work of the young woman is like a penitential sacrifice. It is a common experience among physicians of a university town to write letters, calling the attention of physical directors to some young woman who is being pushed too far in her training. It is the old cry of the girl who will struggle on and not complain. On the sexual side of her life, a young woman is a moral coward, with a huge preponderance of physical courage. There is a sad lack of discretion in those who direct the physical work of college girls. No attention is paid to functional periods, and she cannot "cut her gym" without getting marked. The writer could name several delicate girls who left college on account of their inability to meet the demands of gymnasium work.

The coeducationist has one stereotyped reply to this. "The woman's health is perfect. She is never absent from recita-

tions or from her physical training. She never complains, and she compares more than favorably with that of the men. Therefore she is well, and can't suffer more than a man, because if she did, how could she do her work?" "This talk about girls suffering pain and lassitude and mental tire at certain times is sentimentalism and nonsense. A few may do so, we don't know about it, we teach them and we know. Coeducation has come to stay." The reader may search through the literature of the subject, and if he can find any other answers than those summarized above, he has discovered a logical and sympathetic professor in a college for both sexes, an individual who has had hitherto a mythical existence. There has never been the slightest reference to the fact that sixty per cent. of young women are functional sufferers, that at such times they need rest, not long periods, but short and often repeated periods of rest, as Dr.

Putnam Jacobi shows. The inference is forced upon one that they either are wanting in candor, or are ignorant. If they object to this indictment of unfairness or ignorance, then why do they not meet the facts as thoroughly established by scientific and competent observers upon the subject, in the interest of truth and the physical and mental well-being of the women who are entrusted to their care? Instead of that, they one and all assert what is false, and studiously ignore the teachings of science.

Colleges for both sexes either make no reports upon the health of students, or, when reports are made, they are so compiled that they have no scientific value. In Volume II., page 1888, of the Report for 1899 - 1900 of the Commissioner of Education at Washington, we are enabled to trace the histories of some of these women. We first take the statistics given in the great group of colleges

condensed in the Northern Central Division, comprising twelve States. This division is taken for the reason that it has the largest college population, and that in this group coeducation has the strongest foothold. There are 10,620 women students, of whom only fourteen per cent. complete their college course by taking the various bachelor degrees. The question is obvious: is this enormous loss of eighty-six per cent. due in any way to impaired health, or physical breakdown, or did eighty-six per cent. of the women find after its trial that coeducation was a failure? It is probable that the two factors are mixed, and it would be important to know which factor governed. Contrasting with this the group comprised in the Northern Atlantic Division, which President Murray, in *Collier's Weekly,* with a wit which was keenly appreciated by coeducationists, called a narrow strip of seaboard as provincial as Honduras.

The women students number only 2,675, of whom eighteen per cent. complete their college course. In the absence of carefully collected statistics, it would be impossible to say what proportion of this number of failures is due to impaired health. Probably it is only a comparatively small number. It is not so much a matter of physical breakdown during the pursuit of student life as it is a failure of coeducation itself to meet the expectations of the women in its educational test.

That young women can follow men in the same studies, with the same unremitting study periods, with her radical functional differences, appears upon the face of it an unreasonable proposition. Yet it is one that is made without any qualification by the advocates of bisexual education. A sad feature of this side of the question is that the breakdown may not occur during college, but come to her like a heritage of her violated physiological

life when the final strain is made upon her vitality by motherhood. It is the educated young mothers that show the sad havoc made by maternity; the class that has developed the cerebral faculties at the expense of the brawn and muscle needed at this supreme hour of a woman's life. It is among this class that we find the failure of physiological function that results in sterility, in anæmia, in neurasthenia, and hysteria. Among them we find the carping wife, the woman who bears the burden of an unsatisfied life, of unappeased longings that make life so hard to bear and make her, to those who love her, so difficult to understand. Coeducation ought to aid and to conserve the race, the race of young women upon whom the nation relies to preserve and keep vital the colonial ideal. Faults of education, of training, are causing a profligate waste of this precious element in the national life. We are able to preserve the virility of the men

who will carry onward the colonial tradition, but we fail to keep intact the functional stability of the woman who must contribute of her womanhood, if we are to preserve that regnant race which is known among all the earth as the American.

We are justified in demanding of those who are in charge of the education and training of this class of young women that they permit no spirit of commercialism to stand in the way of reform. A system of education that fails to build a strong and healthy body, that is heedless of the inexorable laws of sex, will, at some future time, find itself on trial at the bar of public opinion, and will be measured, not by its standard of education, but by the damage it has caused to the vitality of American women. It may be heard from every side that the American of the colonial strain is dying out. This is positively true, and is

due to a diminishing birth rate, which, if it continues at its present ratio, will result in extinction in the course of a century. It is almost impossible to believe that an honorable man will make assertions that amount to falsehood simply to make a point in an argument. President Nicholas Murray, in his paper already quoted, says: "Statistics prove that women students and women graduates are healthier than their married sisters." This is simply what the writer states, that marriage and motherhood are the crucial tests of the American woman's vitality, and in which she is found wanting. With fine consistency and a logic peculiar to himself, he continues: "The statistics show that there are fewer childless marriages among them, and that they have a larger proportion of children." The statistics are all the other way, that there are more childless marriages and a smaller number of children to each mar-

riage than is found among the American woman otherwise trained and educated. Well may President Murray remark near the conclusion of his article, "A prejudice well held is worth two convictions." Coeducation has not been the only factor in a restricted birth-rate, as it is of too recent growth, but, going back to 1870, in elaborate articles on the decrease of the birth-rate among American families, by Dr. Nathan Allen, of Lowell, he affords serious matter for thought on the part of coeducationists who have a tendency to quote false statistics. It will be a sad day for America when the story of those who created the Empire of the People is preserved in the voiceless words of the printed page, instead of being vitalized by the current of living tradition.

CHAPTER IV

Does Coeducation Educate?

Coeducation assumes it to be true that men and women, in the final education, which fits them for their various duties in life, require the same education both in methods and kind. If this is correct, then the training of the sexes in mixed colleges is based upon justly assumed premises; if it is not, then coëducation is a retrogression instead of an advance, and is effectual only in doing incalculable harm to those who submit to the method. In higher education the old idea of the humanities for culture is giving place to education for the sake of the utilities. Universities of the first rank

L. of C.

are cutting down their four years' curriculum, filling their last year with elective work so that those who enter the professional schools can complete their college and professional work in seven years instead of eight. Here educators practically admit that preparatory college work must depart from old standards and take special directions with a view of the best training for the different lines of professional study. The lawyer, the doctor, and the man who is preparing for a teaching career, each specialize differently in his junior college year, both with a view of saving time and for better fitness for future work. There is no doubt but that this concession on the part of colleges is a direct advance as it conforms to the utilitarian and commercial period in which we live.

This is a direct challenge to the system of education as carried out in mixed colleges. Change their curriculum as they

may, they cannot alter the fact that the theory of coëducation is lagging hopelessly behind so far as it can furnish any course of electives which will prepare men and women with special fitness for their widely different careers. The sex problem intervenes, as it always has done, and as it always will do. Industrial feminism has so broadened that her education must conform to her new industrial relations. In technical education this has been given practical form, but not in the college curriculum, or in professional schools. There men and women are educated on identical lines without any reference to the wide divergence that in after-life defines their careers even in the same profession. This is not due to those who outlined the curricula of the mixed colleges, but it was a concession to meet the demands of woman, who has, from too hasty generalization, given herself up to the false theory that if she were to be educated

along the identical lines that time-honored traditions and experience have proved were the best for man, she would be able to do a man's work in the same way that man does it. She has assumed that education is able to suppress the sexual differences that exist, not alone physically, but that which is equally marked in the mentality of men and women. These differences, when applied to women, have been called sexual limitations, but sex assigns no limit to the intellectual processes of men and women. These differences are not limitations, but divergences, in mental products. She simply cannot take man's point of view, and the more mature she is and the more thoroughly educated and specialized, the more widely she diverges from man. When industrial feminism has reached a higher level, when women have created their own standards, and ceased to compare themselves industrially with men, they will work as effec-

tually and be given the same recognition. This is not saying that there are two standards of work, one for men and the other for women. There is but one standard for work, that of efficiency, and those for whom the work is rendered will apply it rigidly to men and women alike. Until woman has recognized her own standard and measured her efficiency thereby, she will never do her best work, and show effectually along what lines she is capable of competition with man. In order to create her standard of efficiency, she must begin to plan a system of education that will be most effective in creating a special fitness for her work. She will never do this until she has reconsidered her line of argument by which she formulated the crude theory that an education identical with that acquired by man was the one thing needed. I believe if woman were to do this, and abandon the male standard by which she has fettered her best efforts,

she would not only receive the same industrial recognition, but she would excel him along any lines of work inside of her physical limitations.

And first, coeducation in colleges organized upon the basis of a single sex, and that sex man, must be abandoned. Woman has given it many years of trial, and she ought to have been convinced ere this that it was a flat failure. She has not bettered her position in the professions. She is subordinated by man when she ought to be, by her mental abilities, his coequal. She has labored by his side as diligently and as effectually as he has. Nevertheless he has carried off the prize, while the best that can be said of him is that he was her intellectual equal. Will the woman who so determinedly advocates her right to coeducation stop and reflect upon the fact that the education in which she has had a share was the product of ages of experience, and designed solely

for man; to develop his fitness for his elected life-work, and not to develop her fitness for hers. Coeducation, therefore, unless radically modified for woman's participation in it, is a rank injustice to woman, and does violence to those fine intellectual qualities that she may justly claim as an endowment.

Men who advocate coeducation have seen and admitted sexual differences in mental endowment that demand unlike educational treatment. President Jordan, in his *Popular Science Monthly* article, says: "Women take up higher education because they enjoy it; men because their careers depend on it. Only men, broadly speaking, are capable of objective studies. Only men can learn to face fact without flinching, unswayed by feeling or preference. The reality with women is the way the fact affects them. Original investigation, creative art, the resolute facing of the world as it is, belong to man's world,

not at all to that of the average woman. That women in college do as good work as men is beyond question. In the university they do not, for this difference exists, the rare exception only proving the rule, that women excel in technique, men in actual achievement. If instruction through investigation is the real work of the university, then in the real university the work of the most gifted woman may be only play." Elsewhere he says: "Shall we give our girls the same education as our boys? Yes and no. If we mean by the same, an equal degree of breadth and thoroughness, an equal fitness for high thinking and wise acting, yes, let it be the same. If we mean this: shall we reach this end by exactly the same course of study, then the answer must be no. For the same course of study will not yield the same results with different persons." President Butler, of Columbia, in an article in *Collier's Weekly,* super-

ficially says: "No two men require just the same training, much less all men. The same is true of women, they being human. It appears, then, that the system of education must be elastic enough to take care of infinitely varied individualities. We are just leaving this and acting accordingly."

Making due allowance for President Butler's prejudices, he does not mean what he says. There are not an infinite number of inhabitants on earth, much less individualities.

Professor Slosson, in an article in the *Independent,* already referred to, says: "No two persons should be taught the same things, or in the same way, and the direction of educational progress in the future will be, I hope, toward greater differentiation of studies, methods, and aims. If this occurs, there will be, I believe, a more complete separation of the sexes than now prevails in educational schools."

Whether women will realize the error, and act as energetically in its correction as they were strenuous in their demands for coeducation, time will reveal. They have everything against them now — faculties brought up under the tradition of older education, curricula carefully matured for the benefit of man, to which they are obliged to warp their mental fabric, and, more difficult to overcome than all else, the commercialism that renders their very valuable contributions to the college funds too desirable to be given lightly up.

Let us change from the mistakes made by women to the mistakes made by men, who created the machinery by which women are made to adjust their mental status to that of men. There is no evidence forthcoming from the advocates of the American idea that coeducation as practised is a hybrid produced by the unholy union between two hostile theories.

Already in colleges for men, in the front rank of influence and progress, the old classical cult is on its final trial as to its utility and educational value. What modifications have taken place, or those which are yet to be, are in the interest of man. The bisexual idea takes no part in the new curriculum. This is advance; it is evolution to a higher level in educational methods. Can the mixed colleges join in this advance, and, if they do, can they model their changed methods after that of the single sex institutions, where the evolution is limited in its benefits to men alone? If they adopt the latter, woman must be left out in the plan of betterment, and be made to take her chances in the future as she has done in the past. If, however, woman is to receive due consideration in whatever improvement in methods they deem fit to adopt, it must be given her at the expense of the more perfect system adopted by the single sex college.

In any event, coeducation cannot be kept in the front rank of improvement. It is hopelessly handicapped by striving to make a single organization perform two functions. The conviction cannot be evaded that it stands in the way of progress. This may be a subject upon which the advocates of coeducation may endeavor to establish a contrary conclusion now, but the time is not remote when the truth of our contention will be self-evident. With women in clubs and associations, united in State and national organizations, all demanding the so-called privileges and immunities, real or imaginary, of men, the authorities of the mixed colleges will have a difficult task to convince women that a man's education, either in college or the professional and technical schools, is not the better way to fit her to equal her coworker man in the value of his labor. The strenuous demands of women have carried the author-

ities of colleges, honestly striving to do their best, off their feet. Professors in coeducational institutions have confessed that the extent of the evil was recognized, but so great was the pressure brought to bear by women that no correction appeared possible. There is no evasion of the fact that coeducation is popular with women; still there is not a college in which it exists, that, if it were left to the vote of the men, it would not be promptly suppressed. It cannot be denied that men, who earn their degrees in coeducational colleges, on going out, find that they have to take a lower rank than the men who graduate at Yale, Harvard, or Union. While this does not lessen the value of the education they have acquired at their alma mater, it does impair the social value of what they have worked and paid their money for.

In every way, socially, educationally, and economically, coeducation gives less

out of college life than the students of the single-sex colleges get out of theirs. That a change may be reached, there must be a campaign of education among women outside of college lines, — the hard, bitter education of experience in her battle of life where competition knows no mercy. As long as woman's plaint is heard of scanty recognition and inadequate compensation, just so long she may know that the old errors in her educational training prevail. The trustees who have seen in coeducation a matter of revenue only, will make haste to restore the order of single-sex colleges when they find that men are deserting their institutions. Millions can be lavished upon them without avail, as was proved by the Chicago University, which had surrendered so thoroughly to the sex theory that young men left the institution to preserve their dignity. It was one of the marvels of college admin-

istration to witness the quick change of conviction among the authorities.

It is among two-sex institutions that have grafted the university idea upon the original type of college that the most glaring injustice is measured out to the women students. The medical school, the law school, and the post-graduate courses in the mechanical arts and applied sciences are all modelled upon the needs of the one sex in the practical relations of life. Let us examine her opportunities in medical education by the side of men. It is here that the greatest injustice is done to her. In elementary medicine and the coördinate branches, under the modern method of text-book recitations, her chances are equal, but it is on the practical side that she is made to suffer the penalties of the sex. She must be a brave woman, to heroically overcome what is most repellent to her woman's instinct, or she will find herself thrown upon the world to earn her

own living only half-educated in her chosen calling, and she must do this in the battle with a competition that is merciless. Can it be supposed that a young woman can suppress the heredity of ages of sexual environment and tradition, and look unmoved upon the grossest exhibition of the male form, knowing that she is under the scrutiny of the unsympathetic glances of the men of her class, and preserve through such an ordeal a calmly receptive mind? It is not a matter of modesty, it is one of sex, which has been ignored all through her career as a subject of coeducation. What woman feels and resents is not an attack on her modesty, but on her right of sexual reticence. A man may be as modest as a woman, but he does not mentally retreat before the exhibition of the sexual ideal. A man is only half-sex, his coarser fibre, his lower tone of emotional life, make sex with him something casual, to be encoun-

tered and then forgotten. Woman is all sex, her faculty of potential motherhood, the periodical insistence of her sexual life, like a stigmata, forces the logic of her being into her conscious existence. It becomes with her a physical and a mental attribute. She cannot forget. It is this ever present consciousness that makes her repel the outward token, and throw around it a reticence that is to her sacred. Its invasion rouses her to resistance, not against her sex, but against whatsoever would lay bare her consciousness of physical womanhood. In this lies her weakness in the hard competition with men, but it is also her armor.

In no other relation are these traits so nearly strained to the breaking-point as in coeducational medicine, and in none are they more brutally ignored. Do medical women need the same education in the practical side of education and training as do medical men? It can be positively

answered no. A woman enters upon her practical career a specialist. A specialty with a man physician is a matter of choice, with a woman it is one of necessity. A woman treats the ailments of her sex, admittedly one of the most difficult branches of medicine. Let a single instance of the manner in which the woman student is helped to specialize in her important branch suffice, especially as one of the best and most thorough of the country schools of medicine will be put in evidence, the medical department of Syracuse University. Gynecology is taught only during the last or senior year. The announcement reads as follows: "Didactic lectures, two sessions a week for four months. Clinical lectures, one session a week for four months." Thus all the woman student can learn of what will constitute her life-work is acquired on the theoretical side in thirty-two lectures, and on the practical side in sixteen clinics. Within the knowledge of

the author no other two-sex medical school offers anything better. If women were given the same opportunities for post-graduate hospital appointments as the male graduate, the situation would be partially relieved, but they are not, as but few hospitals throughout the country are open to the appointment of women internes.

"In medicine," says Mr. Finck, "female practitioners are now, and always will be, chiefly specialists in women's diseases, which cannot be taught in mixed classes. The Chicago Medical College came to grief just a year ago, after thirty-two years of existence, because it was organized on the theory that women should have exactly the same training in medicine and surgery as men." (The *Independent.*) Mr. Finck only needed to add, the same training in the same way as men, to make his position complete.

The medical school will offer the defence that it is not its function to educate

specialists, a point well taken if they had not invited into their student body a class that must from the necessity of their limitations become specialists from the first day they offer their services to the public. Is this a fair and equitable division of medical education for men who may become gynecologists if they please, and for women who become gynecologists because they must? Why women submit to this when there are well-equipped medical schools for women, where they are specialized during their student life, and well fitted to enter upon their life-work, is one of the anomalies fostered by the coeducational idea. They have been taught to believe that they cannot compete with men unless they are trained along his lines, or unless so educated that they have lost something that gives to man his preëminence in professional life. Woman will miss her true place in medicine until she realizes that it is her sex and the cosex

of those who seek her skill and sympathy that define her place as a medical woman, and that to be made equal to the demands that will inevitably be made upon her from the very beginning of her career, she must be educated, not as men are, but as women ought to be.

Although women are not as assiduously seeking entrance into the legal profession as they are into medicine, yet even here her work will differ from that of men in the same calling of life, and her usefulness and success will depend upon how well she has been differentiated in education and training to give her special fitness for her legal career. In all the practical sides of life for which women fit themselves by special education, it is not in the fundamentals in which lies the difference in training, but in the more limited and technical side which she will require by reason of her sex.

There is one profession in which sex

offers no obstacle to a successful career, but on the contrary is adorned and made all the more effectual by those traits which hamper her in other callings. It is the profession of teaching, in which she more than keeps her place in the front, and is not in competition with man except in the matter of compensation. Even here she specializes to a degree that is not demanded of her male fellow student. He specializes only in what he has elected to teach; the woman, taught by the inflexible methods implied by coeducation, specializes in the same manner and degree, while the fact is overlooked by those responsible for her education that her career as a teacher will but rarely follow along the same lines. She is thus obliged to further specialize as to what methods will be needed. This the colleges for both sexes do not teach in their pedagogical course. That knowledge she must acquire after she has entered upon her work at the ex-

pense sometimes of her reputation and her professional pride. Any school board, or superintendent, could testify to the doubt as to fitness that attends the appointment of a young college woman to high school or academy work. In Syracuse, Superintendent Blodgett positively stated that he would recommend no college graduate who had not acquired her probational experience elsewhere. It may be asked, is not this true of any young teacher? It is not to an equal degree among the graduates of State normal schools. She specializes there in methods with sole reference as to what she is to teach. Practice and the science of her profession are acquired side by side, and, while coeducation is the rule, men and women are taught the same pedagogical art for the simple reason that they are prepared to teach the same things to pupils of the same educational grade. If the double-sex colleges were to open departments for the training of

grammar and high-school teachers, the woman would have an equal chance with her male coworker. But the coeducational colleges cannot do this; their work must meet the demands of men, and there are but few college men who do not hope to do better than to become grammar or high-school teachers. That coeducation fails to prepare woman in the best manner for a profession in which she has reached the highest distinction, and that those who direct these institutions are conscious of their deficiencies, is proven by the fact that in the coeducational college of teachers and professors less than two per cent. are women. If women were given recognition upon the teaching staff of colleges for both sexes, there is but little doubt that many of the social complications that mar the harmony of these institutions would not occur, or would be minimized, as women by both natural tact and sympathy are better fitted than men

to deal with the psychic moments of the young and emotional of their sex. The spirit of commercialism which rules in these colleges would not tolerate placing women on a parity with men in the teaching force, as the male element in the student body would resent it as an encroachment on their rights, as women in many of these institutions are tolerated, rather than respected.

In view of the restricted opportunities of woman to enter the higher ranks of professional teachers, she is allowed, and even encouraged, to fritter away precious time in doing elaborate postgraduate work with a view to earning advanced degrees that can be of no possible use to her except that she may be prepared to take a professor's chair, which we have already shown, by the small ratios of women professors in mixed colleges, is from necessity nearly closed against her. In the science courses of these colleges she

is induced to specialize, with a view to professional work in architecture, geology, chemistry, and electricity, which, if she is not to teach these subjects, is wasted time, as her physical limitations would seriously hamper her if she followed them practically in after-life in competition with men. Modern industrial feminism has opened many occupations which were formerly restricted to men, and in which she is an active and successful competitor, but it will be observed that this invasion of man's industrial field begins when woman is physically the coequal of man, and ends abruptly at the line where this equality ceases and man's physical superiority begins. In the higher education of women this line must be known and strictly observed if women are to be given an equal chance in active life in which the inexorable law of commercialism rules. In the mixed college, in which women are educated on the standard and after the

method of men, can this line be followed, or is any attempt made to follow it? It must be known to every competent educator that her active life must diverge from that of man, and that beyond this industrial line there can be nothing in common between them.

Education from the grammar school to the college has but one object in view, namely, to make good citizens and to fit the subject for the career in life best adapted to success and happiness. The thousands of young women in coeducational colleges are not seeking education for the purpose of becoming teachers, doctors, lawyers, or professors, but they are looking forward to marriage, maternity, and social success. They cannot be educated too highly, refined too finely, made too womanly for the destiny, the joys of which have bloomed perennially in the hearts of women. The American woman is the most marvellous human product of

any age, or land. Educate, refine, and cultivate her and she lends herself to this with an innate facility; there is no grace lacking to distinguish her from the daughter of a hundred earls. Cast at the most plastic period of her life, without restraint, and in the midst of a social environment that must blunt her finer social instincts, without the advice of the older and cultured of her sex, coeducation can give her nothing in return for the cost of this.

In view of the facts presented, coeducation cannot be regarded as an advance in educational methods, or as giving an adequate return for the time spent or the possible dangers that attend the system. If not an advance, then it is a retroaction, and a misdirection of educational efforts. Its methods are wrong, and the social environment which the system creates is hostile to sound education and good manners.

The young woman graduate has no re-

sources except teaching or matrimony, as but few of them enter the professions. As already shown (Chapter II.) she is above teaching children in the primary schools, and until her egoism is toned down by contact with the asperities of real life she is above matrimony as well. She is not fitted for commercial work, because she has never been taught practical business methods. She joins the great army of unemployed, prevented, by what President Jordan calls the " true college spirit," from seeking a new education in a wage-earning occupation. The literature of the coeducation movement may be searched in vain for any demand for an elective business training such as would bring the young woman graduate into actual competition with the young man graduate who enters business. A few colleges have bookkeeping courses, more with a view to teaching than for practical use. Nowhere are the typewriter and stenography given

any place, without a knowledge of which most business offices are closed to the applicant.

A doubt is cast upon the educational value of mixed colleges with a curricula common to both sexes by the fact that those who have seriously studied the subject are not in agreement concerning the education of women. The president of Bryn Mawr says that women ought to be educated after the manner of men. Presidents Murray, Harper, Quimby, Jordan, and Eliot say that she requires a different course of study. Among experts who have had excellent opportunities of observing woman in the rough and in the educated product, there is no accord in opinion as to the value of coeducation. This divergence on the part of educators must be logically explainable. Is it not that they are disappointed in the results? The women who have been so trained have not shown the scholarship, the fitness for the

after earning life, that they had hoped for. That when the theoretical phase of coeducation was passed, and they were confronted by the results, there was inefficiency, lack of purpose, and unfitness for practical life for women trained on a theory, that was not found among women who were not coeducated, or had received no college education.

CHAPTER V

The Social Side of Life in Mixed Colleges

THE relations existing among the young men and women in colleges for both sexes have centred the attention of the public upon the problem of coeducation. It has afforded the public more subjects of complaint and criticism, and given the college authorities more opportunities to defend, than all other phases of the question combined. From an educational point of view it has not the importance of some of the topics discussed here, but it is one that appeals to all those who have daughters undergoing the trials of coeducation, and to that larger public that takes either

a genuine or a morbid interest in whatever excites a constantly renewed attention. The escapades of the students afford a never-failing interest to the readers of newspapers, while the more glaring breaches of social convention are sent broadcast over the country by the news agencies. The attitude of the press toward this side of education is either one of comical narration or of scorching comment, so that the important and serious problem of higher education for women has, through the questionable social attitude forced upon them by coeducation, lost its dignity and become a matter of doubt and apprehension on the part of all right-thinking people.

It is proper, before going further, to allow the advocates of the mixed college methods to state what they are doing, or expect to do, for young men and women in a social way, because it is in this direction that they claim to reach the better

and more practical results. These are among the latest utterances upon the subject, and will be given without comment, in order that the reader may draw his own conclusions from contrasting these statements of mere opinion on the part of coeducators with the facts as they actually occur.

President Butler says: "A wise college president wrote a few years ago that this intertraining and equal training take the simper out of the young woman and the roughness out of the young man. He was right. The woman who grows up surrounded by women and taught only by women, and the man who grows up surrounded by men and taught only by men, are a long time maturing. Both are abnormal. The artificiality and the absurdity of the ordinary relations between men and women are chiefly due to social traditions, which gave rise to the system of separate education. Comradeship and

friendship are eliminated, and the only conceivable associations with the other sex are love and marriage."

President Jordan says: "Another condition very common and very undesirable is that in which young women live at home and traverse a city twice each day on railway or street cars to meet their recitations in some college. The greatest instrument of culture in a college is the college atmosphere, the personal influence exerted by its professors and students. The college atmosphere develops feebly in the rush of a great city. The *spurstudenten,* or railway-track students, as the Germans call them, the students who live far from the university, get very little of this atmosphere. The young woman who attends the university under these conditions contributes nothing to the university atmosphere, and therefore receives very little from it. If young women enter the colleges, they should demand that suitable

places be made for them. Failing to find this, they should look for it somewhere else." Previous to this quotation, he says: "When young women have no residence devoted to their use, and are forced to rent parlors and garrets in private houses of an unsympathetic village, associations which develop vulgarity cannot be used for the promotion of culture either for men or for women. That the influence of cultured women on the whole is opposed to vulgarity is a powerful argument for education."

Prof. E. E. Slosson, of the University of Wyoming, says in a very recent article in the *Independent:* "The sole remedy — or preventative, for I know of no remedy — for sexual hyperesthesia, is normal casual contact between men and women, especially when young, in their daily tasks and pleasures. As in electricity, the more complete the insulation, the higher the potential rises on each side until in-

stead of comparatively harmless sparkling we get a thunderbolt. No amount of formal meeting in society will accomplish this purpose. All balls are masked balls. To separate the sexes at the ages of, say thirty-five to forty, or nine to twelve, would do little harm, but to separate them completely, or, what is still worse, incompletely, between the ages of fifteen to twenty, is often injurious. I willingly admit that coeducation will not work well in some classes of society and with certain people. In fact, I think it requires a high standard of morals and intelligence to be even tolerable. There are girls who are not even fit to be sent to a coeducational college; who get harm and do harm. When such are detected, the president usually invites them to his private office, and gives them the same advice that Hamlet gave to Ophelia. But it should be said in fairness that such cases are more

often the result of perverted training than of any congenital defect."

President Barnard, as quoted in Report of Commissioner of Education at Washington, 1900-01, says: "But it is still objected that though the association of young women with young men in college may be beneficial to the ruder sex, it is likely to be otherwise to the gentler. The delicacy and reserve which constitute in so high a degree the charm of the female character are liable, it is said, to be worn off in the unceremonious intercourse of academic life, and the girl who enters college a modest, shrinking maiden is likely to come out a romping hoiden or a self-asserting dogmatist. Those who make this objection argue rather from assumed premises than from any facts of observation."

Having given the assertions of the advocates of coeducation concerning the social life in mixed colleges, let us give

in contrast a few incidents that lead one to believe that the irrepressible problem of sex will, when left to the operation of its pristine laws, effect its own solution. These incidents are taken from the daily press, some local and others coming through the associated press. If not true, it would have been well for the reputations of the institutions concerned to have demanded immediate retraction. As the statements were never denied or retracted, it is perfectly proper to assume that they are true. There is ample material of this character to make a volume, but space can only be given to such as will demonstrate the condition of social life created in colleges in which the sexes hold unrestrained relations.

The following is from the New York *Times* of October 18, 1902. A young woman during the night desired to remove some freshman colors placed on the roof of a building. "The fire-escape over

which the ascent was made is in front of Willard Hall, and leads from the fourth floor to the roof. It leans from the building as it leads to the roof, making the feat a daring one. After the young woman descended, she admitted that she was frightened as she climbed the iron ladder, and when she leaned over the side of the building to place the sophomore banner; the fact that the skylight had been ordered closed by the authorities in charge of the hall left the fire-escape as the only means of reaching the roof. The freshman-sophomore fight is now on in earnest." Further details are given, but it would not add to the significance of the daring act to repeat them here. This took place at Northwestern University, which has a large population of women compared to men (290 men, 280 women, in 1900). That which concerns us here is not that this woman made such a daring and unwomanly effort, for women have an in-

stinctive fear of climbing and high places, but why did she wish to do it, what force was at work in her mental equipment strong enough to impel her to act counter to the innate fears that belong to the uncultured woman? It may be due to that quality in coeducation which, as President Murray Butler so delicately says, "takes the simper out of the young woman and the roughness out of the young man," a statement which is repeated *ad nauseam* in all coeducation arguments. It would be more to the truth to say that this "roughness" of the young men, which coeducation had failed to eliminate, had infected the young women and impelled them, by taking out their "simper," to emulate the young men. Many other incidents of this character could be related, and are as well if not better known to coeducationists than to others. And yet Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, with great complacency, states: "In not a single instance

is an argument against coeducation given which offers sufficient ground for the proposed retrogressive movement." (New York *Sun,* July 6, 1902.) In this same university the evils of the unrestrained relation of the sexes is awakening a reactionary spirit. In the English classes the "coeds" declare that love-making has become "too prevalent a practice and has been carried altogether too far. They joined in the declaration that while men were awkward and women timid when the sexes were separated, there are concealed in the sheep's clothing of coeducational virtue many ravaging wolves. Coeducation in the class-room ends in cowalking on the campus. The girls contended that, pleasant as they were, extended strolls along the lake front were not conducive to good lessons." (Associated News, Syracuse *Herald,* January 25, 1903.) It was at this university, as already related in another chapter, that, following the an-

nouncement of the scholarship awards, the betrothal of two young men to two senior coeds was made known. (New York *Sun*, September 28, 1902.) It is very evident that there was no control of the relations of the sexes on the part of the faculty, and that a dangerous degree of license prevailed, against which the women recoiled in self-defence. Additional facts illustrating the social life prevailing in mixed colleges are furnished by the Syracuse University. The author has no excuse to offer in referring to a local institution, because the university is one of the best, if not the best, coeducational college in the United States. Its student body is composed of a superior class of young women and men. The head of the university, Chancellor Day, is firm and conscientious in his government, and the university has greatly prospered under his wise management. The faculty is a body of men, earnest and faithful in their work,

and who, while they believe sincerely in the methods of coeducation, would not hesitate to either segregate or eliminate women from the student body if they were convinced that coeducation was wrong. It certainly follows that if social matters assume a state of threatening tension in such a carefully conducted university as Syracuse, the conditions existing in the so-called colleges of the West, for instance, must create the need for greater force in repression. The following incident illustrates the generally prevailing method of controlling social affairs among students in mixed colleges, and was the one followed at Syracuse until a crisis occurred in the social life at the college in the winter of 1903.

"The way the students of Syracuse University take it upon themselves to regulate the evils of coeducation in the university was brought to light yesterday in a rather interesting manner. The uni-

versity authorities provide no rules for the government of the students except that they are expected to abide by the laws of the city as citizens, and generally that is all that is needed. Occasionally an offence occurs, and then the upper class men are expected to take the matter in hand. Such a case has been running along for some time since the opening of college, and last night the crisis was reached. The offenders, there were two of them, had been spending most of their spare time 'going fussing,' either to one of the sorority houses or to one of the boarding-houses. Saturday night the upper class men, belonging to the same fraternity as the offenders, packed the young men's trunks, hired a cartman, and sent them down early in the evening, one to the chapter-house and the other to the boarding-house. The trunks were labelled with the owners' cards and the statement that the owners would

be around to claim a room, and take the first regular meals Monday morning. The young men were not able to get their trunks back without stirring up a deal of comment from the other students who had heard of the affair." (Syracuse *Herald*, October 21, 1902.)

"A meeting of the representatives of the fraternities and of the neutral organizations of Syracuse University will be called soon by Chancellor Day and Dean Frank Smalley to formulate plans for regulating the social life of the university. The authorities have made no startling disclosures and have discovered no new evils, but they have decided that it is time to restrict the amount of 'fussing' done by the young men, and the number of 'fudge parties' given by the young women. Fussing is the term used to describe calling on young women. During the last year or two evils have grown up which the authorities think need correct-

ing. Chief among them is the amount of calling done by the young men upon the young women and the number of fudge parties and dances held, several of them every week. The fraternities, and especially the sororities, are considered the chief offenders along the lines of parties and dances, although a large number of small parties are held during the year by the various boarding-houses which are frequented largely by the neutrals. The idea of holding a dance at the chapter-houses once or twice a month has taken hold of some of the fraternities so that the dance has become a regular feature of fraternity life at those places. Another source of evil is the number of freshman parties held by the fraternities: every one of the fifteen fraternities plan to hold a party during the college year in honor of the freshmen; then each fraternity usually entertains during the year in honor of other class

delegations. Dances are frequently given by the other organizations. The university band is holding a series of 'band hops' at Empire Hall this winter, which are held whenever there is a week that there is no other function scheduled. In addition to this, two other societies, the Double Seven, composed of sophomores, and the Moux Head, composed of juniors, have been organized especially for social purposes.

"The university authorities have always been in favor of pleasant social relations between the men and women students in the university, but they believe that the social whirl has been kept up without sufficient periods of rest, and one case is reported of a student who had declared repeatedly that he had no time for society, who had his life made miserable for him until he went 'fussing' with the others. The authorities say that what does the harm is the taking of the students away

from their work two or three times a week, keeping them up half the night, with the result that failures are recorded against them the following days in the class-rooms. Letters have come from the parents of young women asking that the girls be restricted from attending so many affairs. The university cannot well do this, as it has no control over those who do not live in the dormitory, Winchell Hall. There the door is closed at ten o'clock, and no one can get in later except those who have had permission to be out. This privilege is granted largely that the girls may attend the theatres, but even then no one can get in after twelve under any consideration. The plan, Dean Smalley says, is to call a meeting of the representatives of the various student organizations, and discuss the matter in an open congress. The dean said that he did not believe in the laying down of any strict rules on the matter, but that it

should be discussed in an open conference, and that the evil should be adjusted by the students themselves, so soon as they see what the trouble is." (Syracuse *Herald,* December 13, 1902.) The above extract represents a state of affairs that the wise and witty President Butler, in his *Collier's Weekly* article, says " are all dead issues," but Syracuse University found them very much alive, as we shall learn when we find how the theory of the " open conference " worked out in practice. The idea that mixed colleges have no authority over their students because they are not resident in dormitories is one of the most pernicious errors of the system. None of the poorer colleges have dormitories, and the students are scattered through the towns in boarding-houses, with no guides to good manners or good morals. President Jordan, in his *Popular Science* article, says of it: " Students living at home or in boarding-houses of an unsympathetic

village, or travelling daily on railway or street cars, can contribute nothing to the college atmosphere, the personal influence exerted by its professors and students. The young woman who attends the university under these conditions contributes nothing to the university atmosphere, and therefore receives very little from it. She may attend her recitations and pass her examinations, but she is in all essential respects *in absentia,* and, so far as the best influences of the university are concerned, she is neither coeducated nor educated. If young women enter colleges, they should demand that suitable places be made for them. Failing to find this, they should look for it somewhere else. Associations which develop vulgarity cannot be used for the promotion of culture, either for men or for women." The facts, however, show that President Jordan is wrong about the "college atmosphere" developed by the dormitory system. Whether

he would include the chapter-houses as offering "associations which develop vulgarity," it is difficult to say, but as they are certainly not "*in absentia*" we conclude not. From the evidence already given, it appears that the effort to create environments best calculated to develop the college atmosphere, and which the most conservative coeducationists believe will afford a remedy for the admitted evils of the system, are the means of introducing additional complications in the social control of students in mixed colleges. Before the introduction of chapter-houses and the erection of Winchell Hall at Syracuse University, and while the women students were scattered in boarding-houses, but little was heard of social excesses or improper liberties between the sexes. Here there was as complete separation between the sexes as was possible. The meetings occurred only in the class-room or in the streets. With concentra-

tion, trouble began. The young men were more difficult to control. Class rows at supper parties in suburban taverns or city hotels were the cause of great damage to private property. The moral tone of the young men was lowered, and nothing but threats of wholesale suspensions or expulsions unless the damages were paid for by the offending classes kept the students under control. No sense of wrong in these disorders appeared to appeal to the young men. On the contrary, they indulged in disrespectful and hostile criticism of the college authorities, until they felt the iron hand of Chancellor Day. Now the influence of the "cultured young women," from which President Jordan expects so much, was anything but wholesome, as a share of the hostile comment on the authorities came from them. Women have ever been the incentive of deeds of prowess and strength among men. From the belted knight at the tourney to the crude and

misdirected valor of a young man in a mixed college, the plaudits of fair hands will always be the crowning glory. It is the mistake of coeducationists to assume that the massing of young men and women together for purposes of education could in any way modify the sexual complexity. It is their proud boast that the presence of young women has a refining and elevating influence upon young men when mixed in education. The constant contention is made of the influence of "cultured" young women upon young men. They are not cultured; they are being cultured. Character is unformed. They are plastic, unrefined, and have not yet attained the stage of influence. On the contrary, it has been shown that when the young women were massed, instead of scattered in isolated boarding-houses, the men became rougher and their horse-play more aggressive, which even the women strive to emulate, as we shall see when what

may be called the assault on Winchell Hall is described.

The efforts of the faculty to suppress the pernicious social activity of the fraternities and clubs by calling into council and coöperation the representatives of the student bodies culminated in an outbreak of social license which caused the citizens of Syracuse to hold their breath. The following is the newspaper account of the incident, which resulted from a condition of affairs that had been in existence for some time, and was steadily growing worse.

" Two college women, one a junior and the other a freshman, were expelled from the university yesterday noon by Chancellor James R. Day for attending a dance at Long Branch last Friday night. By so doing they disobeyed a regulation of Winchell Hall, the women's dormitory, at which they were living. This is the first action of the kind which has ever been

taken by Syracuse University. There was broadcast consternation among the students of the university when it was learned that two of their number had been expelled for doing something they had come to regard as only a harmless amusement. The chancellor's action yesterday is another move in his policy in guiding the young women of the university in the way he thinks they should go. At Winchell Hall, which is university property, stricter rules have been laid down than ever before, and the students living there are expected to adhere to them. Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday nights are calling hours, and all young women must be home from practice and college dancing affairs before midnight. Long Branch has been tabooed." Long Branch, it may be explained, is a resort on Onondaga Lake, with dance-halls, bowling-alleys, and bar. It is outside the police jurisdiction of the city, and during the winter

months is a rough resort, never frequented by the better class of the community. "Last Friday night Mrs. J. A. R. Scott, chaperon of the Hall, called the young women in question into her apartment and asked them if they intended going to the lake to dance that evening. They told her that such was their intention, and they were requested not to go. The college men, with whom the young women had made the engagement for the party, called for them, and were made acquainted with the rule of the Hall. There was a misunderstanding here, it is said, and the party went out not intending to go to the lake. Then the plan was changed again, and it was decided to go to Long Branch only to bowl. The students knew that other college women would be at Long Branch that night, members of leading fraternities on University Hill. It was finally decided to go to the lake to bowl only, and the die was cast. When the

girls and their escorts reached Long Branch and started to bowl, the music from the upper floor was wafted down to them, and they could hear the light steps of the dancers as they glided over the smooth floor. Thinking there could be no harm in a single waltz or a rousing two-step, bowling lost its charm for them, and the party went to the dance-hall and spent a portion of the evening. They arrived home before midnight, however, according to the story. The next morning Mrs. Scott was informed that the young women in question had gone to the lake the night before. The matter was reported. Chancellor Day acted yesterday. It is understood that there is another young woman of the university living at Winchell Hall who may leave the university for a reason similar to that which has brought about the expulsion of the others. The chancellor said last evening that the case is

not yet decided." (*Post-Standard,* February 4, 1903.)

As an evidence of how deeply this social license had contaminated the students, both men and women, the spirit of insubordination evoked by the disciplinary orders of the chancellor is sufficient. "The students feel that the authorities have been too severe in expelling these two women and in allowing the fifty or seventy-five others who went across the lake to go free. The only difference was, they say, that these two were from Winchell Hall, where the rules forbid the women being out after twelve o'clock, and the others were from chapter-houses and boarding-houses." (Syracuse *Evening Herald,* February 4, 1903.) As already stated, this condition in the social life of the university grew out of the theory that the fraternities and inmates of sorority-houses would meet in a proper spirit the wishes of the faculty in limiting the num-

ber of social affairs and for earlier hours, but they proved the chief offenders in defying college authority. All healthy and proper college spirit seemed to have disappeared in a "college atmosphere" different from that which President Jordan believed would be created by coeducation, while the college authorities at Syracuse were taught some unpleasant truths about the mutual reaction of young men and young women when left to govern themselves.

The efforts of the faculty to limit the meetings of the students by ordering a stop to the band dances was met by the students with a spirit not becoming in those who enter college for the serious purpose of study and moral discipline. From bad they went to worse in organizing the dances across the lake. When the order was issued placing the women in boarding and sorority houses under the same restrictions as the Winchell Hall

women, the students affected by the order were disposed to stand upon their rights, quoting the university catalogue, which reads: "The university does not provide board or rooms for its students. They select their rooms with the advice of the faculty, and become amenable, like other citizens, to the laws and ordinances of the city." This defines the attitude of the faculty toward the students, with the result, so far as relates to the women, as just described. The order of Chancellor Day wisely reversed the policy of the institution in this regard. In a chapel address he clinched his circular order, and put an end to any rebellion on the part of the women. "It is said that the administration may have authority over Winchell Hall, but not over the different fraternity and boarding houses. Let me tell you that the university has absolute authority over everything connected with this institution. The univer-

sity trustees could, by a motion, if they so desired, remove the franchise of every fraternity on this hill. Fraternities, if properly run, are a great service, but there is another side. They sometimes conceal members and protect culprits. The authority of this institution reaches over all. Whenever the university speaks the fraternities and other clubs will have to observe the rules laid down. In closing his address the chancellor declared that the women of the university must be placed within greater restrictions than the men, not because they were more evilly inclined, but in order to avoid any appearances of a questionable character." (Syracuse *Journal,* February 11, 1903.)

Thus falls to the ground one of the most ardently asserted benefits of coeducation on the social equality theory, namely, the refining and restraining influences exerted by the free and unrestricted social relation of the students. Any un-

biassed student of weak human nature could predict such a result unfailing. The conclusion is a logical one, that, according to the authorities of the best coeducational college in the country, young women cannot be educated the same way as young men in a moral and social sense.

We have seen the bad and degenerating effect of young men upon women in colleges for both sexes; let us see if the women have the elevating, refining, and wholesome influence upon young men that the advocates of the system claim they have. We shall be obliged to again refer to the newspapers.

The occasion was the sophomore dinner at one of the hotels, which the freshmen endeavored to interrupt. Early in the evening the president of the freshman class called on a young woman in a near-by sorority-house. Several sophomores present proposed that he do a few stunts for the amusement of the young woman. A

one-sided fight resulted, from which the freshman tried to escape through the kitchen. Here he was met by the upper class-men and his retreat cut off. Additional freshmen coming to the rescue, a destructive free fight resulted. The young women of the house ran screaming into the street, their cries attracting a crowd of passers-by and residents of the hill. At the hotel the rioting was renewed by the freshmen, which a force of police kept within bounds. At the banquet fifty "couples" were present. (Syracuse *Journal,* February 2, 1903.)

At Syracuse it is the usual thing for the freshmen to prevent the sophomore banquet, but a peculiar element of hostility was added by the attempt of some class-men to make the president do "stunts" for the amusement of young women sophomores, while he was a guest in their house. As good manners, refinement, gentlemanly reserve, and respect and cour-

tesy toward women is claimed to be a direct outcome of the presence of women in coeducation, it is proper to leave the reader to come to his own conclusion in this case.

A freshman flag displayed from the roof of Winchell Hall caused a determined assault on the building to remove it. Access could be gained to the roof only by the fire-escape. Several men climbed the ladder. "Within the dormitory all was excitement. From the upper windows of the building there opened a continuous stream of water, old shoes, dismantled books, and every conceivable missile at the men on the iron ladder. The leader kept on climbing; once, however, he faltered. A full-grown dictionary, hurled from a window two stories above, struck him between the shoulders. The force of the shock knocked his feet from the ladder. He clung fast until he had recovered his breath, and then continued

up the ladder. He was immediately followed by several of his companions, and the banner was soon in their possession." (Syracuse *Journal,* February 21, 1903.)

It may appear that the influence of the women on the sophomores was somewhat remote, but their quickness to adopt the methods of the men in maintaining their class spirit was evident, and painfully so, from the standpoint of the coeducationists, who make such extravagant claims for the refining influence of women. A few more incidents and we shall conclude the evidence upon this disagreeable phase of the subject. "The Chicago coeds practised football tactics in their contest for basket-ball prestige on their new athletic field yesterday, and the result was that one girl was carried from the game and two others had to be revived with water before they could continue." (Newspaper clipping.) At Cornell, which is one of the most conservative col-

leges, the women pattern after the men, the "freshmen" trying to break up the sophomore young women's supper. They captured a member of the upper class and drove about the city in a hack during the evening. (Mr. Finck, in the *Independent.*)

Moving-up day appears to be an anniversary peculiar to Syracuse; what its nature may be is not essential to the story; as the years passed it was attended with more serious disorders. In 1902 the disorders were so great as to exact pledges from the students that the riotous proceedings would be omitted in future. The year 1903 witnessed open defiance of the faculty, while riot reigned upon the hill. "Chancellor Day dwelt upon the breach of trust, the betrayed confidence, and the deceitful conduct of the freshman class." The result was the suspension of the freshman class "until all trace of last night's rowdyism was removed." (Syra-

cuse *Journal,* May 11, 1903.) The freshmen were rebellious, meetings were held, they absented themselves from chapel. "The seats on the freshman side of the house were entirely vacant, the students of neither sex being present." (Syracuse *Evening Herald,* May 11, 1903.) "Refined and cultured" young women aiding and encouraging a crowd of half-fledged youth in defiance of law and decency is the spectacle offered by coeducation in this instance. It is highly probable that the young men would not have resorted to such extremes if they were not applauded by the young women. At Northwestern University the young men were accustomed to stand upon the campus and whistle fraternity airs near Willard and Pearson Halls, to which the young women would respond by joining them. Dean Martha Crow discovered that the young women would leave very early for prayer-meeting for the purpose of meeting the

men. "Then came rumors, then revelations, and at last the declaration that the girls must never again respond to calls beneath their windows." (Press despatch, Syracuse *Evening Herald,* May 15, 1903.)

Instances such as have been given could be increased by the score in colleges where the unrestrained social relation of the sexes is permitted. But sufficient evidence is given to prove that it is the social life that suffers the greatest peril. If education is to form character, if it is to create the wholesome sense of social reserve, that is the safeguard of woman in after-life, then the facts that we have cited make unrestricted coeducation the most dangerous social experiment ever undertaken. It is all the more dangerous to the moral well-being of the women students from the fact that these students come from the middle class, as we understand the word here; that is, they are the daughters mostly of poor parents, and all that they

know of social life and its amenities is learned in the crude environment of a coeducational college. The professors themselves, to whom they look as models of social deportment, leave college or technical schools to take their chairs, and are grossly ignorant of social conventions, which may be regarded as one of the causes of the social irregularities that have been allowed to exist.

Syracuse University was one of the first of the coeducational institutions to admit the inability of the faculty to exert any restraining influence over the social relations existing among the students. Up to the present year men and women were allowed to live in the same house. The low standard of scholarship of students so situated, and social irregularities that resulted, have caused the faculty to extend to students in mixed boarding-houses and dormitories the same rules which have been established at Winchell Hall. The new

rules say in part: "The university authorities have become impressed with the importance of a little more care in the rooming habits of the students at the institution. Therefore, hereafter, our friends who take student boarders will kindly restrict their roomers to one sex. We wish also to urge upon you that our women students will not be allowed to retain rooms in any house if they are allowed to receive young men callers in their rooms. We will be grateful to you if you will inform us promptly if your roomers do not regard reasonable hours, or if you have what you believe to be just complaint of any kind. Hereafter students will not be allowed to room or board at any house that is not registered at the office of the registrar of the university." (Syracuse *Evening Herald,* June 6, 1903.) If we are obliged to have the sexes trained in mixed colleges, every friend will rejoice at this complete breakdown of the practice of un-

restrained social relations between men and women students. As we have shown, in opinions quoted at the opening of this chapter, this feature of the method, which has caused such damage both to the social well-being and scholarship at Syracuse, is regarded as a necessity in the formation of character and correct social habits. "It takes the simper out of a young woman," as one able authority on coeducation puts it. It ought, indeed, where young women receive men in their rooms. One of the benefits that coeducationists hold before the public from which they recruit their ranks, is that the free mingling of the sexes in college education makes the men more manly and the women more womanly, and trains young men in the courtesy and respect which they ought to show toward women. In view of what has already been related, a more ridiculous claim can scarcely be imagined. But, leaving that out, we are not in debt to coed-

ucation for the position women hold in America. Among no other people and under no other civilization has woman enjoyed so high a place as here. Chivalrous courtesy and respect have been awarded her from the strenuous days of the Colonial mothers to the present. This innate chivalry and grace which the American man bears to the American woman is not the product of the university or the college. It is found in all walks of life, and has been the admiration of foreigners and the boast of our manhood. It is the impulse that has impelled men to grant to woman her claim to equal political rights, to better pay for her labor, that has given her social freedom from the restraints that hedge her in older civilizations, and exalted her to a level that elsewhere she has never attained. This springs from an impulse higher than education, that had its origin in our hard struggle for political life and freedom, when

woman bore her share in the stress and privation by the side of her male compatriot. She earned then her recognition and sanctification in the hearts of men who loved her that has outworn the generations, and has worn ever since with matchless grace her crown of American womanhood. The shameless claim that coeducation will make our young men more considerate for women ought to brand it as a sham and an insult to our manhood.

The evidence shows that there is nothing in coeducation to elevate, but everything to lower, women in the esteem of her fellow students. In fact, when young women are exposed to the deteriorating influences of a college for both sexes, she invites her own degradation. She demands education after the manner of men, but she also demands treatment such as men give to men. The writer became aware of this fact by seeing two students pass

in the street. They were walking rapidly, affecting an athletic stride; without lifting his hat and with a cold stare, he said, "Hello, Nan;" she returned a curt "Hello, Jack," and both passed rapidly on. This, it appeared, was correct form. Some young men insist on lifting their hats, but they are regarded as Miss Nancys, and the practice is frowned upon by the women. This, of course, is a mere trifle, but trifles make for home life, which the extremists claim coeducation promotes in all its sacredness and purity.

CHAPTER VI

Love and Marriage

THE following was sent to the press through the news agencies, and was widely published: "Chicago, June 20: Terminating courtship lasting throughout their college course, four Northwestern University students announced their engagements on the stage of the Auditorium. Following the announcement of the scholarship awards, the betrothal of two young men to two young senior coeds was made known. It was the first time in the history of a Western university that the announcement of student betrothals was officially made by the university officials." The chancellor of a minor university, on

being interviewed concerning student courtship and marriage, is reported to have said that the more marriages the better, as it was a good place to fall in love. As the conversation reported was never denied, it is assumed to be correct. Vital statistics record only three events in human life: birth, marriage, and death. Marriage implies in its relationship more of happiness and morality, or more of falsehood, deceit, and crime than can be crowded into any other act between man and woman, but under the morbid stimulus of coeducation it is stripped of the beauty of holiness and trotted out upon a stage to be greeted by the college yell. It is true that these young and immature people were only betrothed, not married, and let us hope that these shrinking, timid maids, with native modesty refined by the exquisite culture which the advocates of coeducation would have us believe is a special feature of their method, were dis-

enchanted and brought back to the stern realities of life by the strident college yell.

In the towns in which these bisexual colleges are located, nothing so tends to bring these institutions into disrespect as the apparent indifference of the college authorities to the open love-affairs between the students. They are openly spoken of as "match factories." Courtship seems to be a continuous performance, and whether with a view to marriage or not, only the Providence which can scan the human mind in its secret places knows, but for the sake of purity and innocence let us hope. It may well be that the chancellor, to the interview with whom we have just referred, took counsel with his fears when he said the more marriages the better. He was a Christian gentleman, and an old man and shrewd, and from his long experience with life

he probably was in full accord with St. Paul.

It is difficult to understand how staid and serious men, to whom is entrusted the education of young men and women, can see any good in student courtship and marriage. It is conceded by all educators that the terminal aim of education is the development of character. A character justly balanced, with discrimination and a clarity of vision, and a character made strong in the direction of self-control, is the best and highest test of a well-trained mind. To one who regards a question of this kind without prejudice, it would appear impossible that an educator could claim that a young man or woman receives as a product of his intellectual training this high criterion fully formed with his diploma, but rather he is given the right direction, he has acquired a standard grounded on rectitude and honor by which he can measure the character that

will mark him as a man in that higher education he must acquire in the great university of practical life. The advocates of student marriages make the positive assertion that it is better for the man and the young woman to get married while life is all untried and is as yet a formless ideal. They are deliberately told to get married as though it were a part of their college curriculum, and to step forth from the sheltering arms of their alma mater man and wife, untrained and unarmed, to battle with life, the most uncertain quantity and quality, for good or otherwise, that can be condensed in the human document. Surely men will allow their prejudices or their predilections to give strange distortions to their moral vision.

The writer is willing to leave the question to the arbitration of any man who has acquired eminence in his profession, be he doctor, lawyer, or engineer, if a student

can leave college a married man before he has entered upon his professional studies, and give to them the same time, the same earnest and thorough work, as one who is unmarried, and whose mind is not preoccupied by thoughts and emotions foreign to the work before him. The coeducationists say that he can. Further, the question can be left to the same arbitrator. Can a young professional man, doctor, lawyer, or engineer, married at the outset of his professional career, have the same opportunity of commanding all the chances that make for success and eminence, as the young man unhampered by a wife until he has acquired a fixed position and a settled income? The coeducationist again says that he can. There is no holding any argument with such people. They defy all the traditions of experience, good judgment, and settled standards. There is not an instance in the literature of the question in which the

advocates of coeducation have discussed the subject calmly, philosophically, and with any evidence of clean hands and hearts. They approach a great problem of education, one that lies at the nucleus of the higher education of women, with rank assertion, their only argument being abuse and ridicule of those who doubt or disbelieve their methods. They are educational pachyderms, and the only argument that can penetrate is the one that holds up before them the dollar-mark. Then they can perceive some logic on the other side, and hasten, like the Northwestern University, to segregate, but not abandon the two-sex idea.

Many coeducational colleges deliberately encourage courtship and marriage. President Wilkinson, of the Kansas State Normal School, says that the college presents the best time and place for match-making. In President Thwing's book, "The College Woman," he mentions a

college in which a day following commencement was set apart as the day of weddings. Former President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, approved of college engagements. President Thwing says that coeducation does promote love and matrimony in college, but that it does not promote scholarship. (Mr. Finck, in the *Independent.*)

In all that has been said by coeducationists about student courtship and marriage, not a word has been spoken about the rights of parents, or guardians, or family interests in these marriages. This side of the student marriages has been insultingly ignored. If the college faculty approved of these marriages, such a trifling matter as the consent of parents or family interest in the marriage of the son or daughter might safely be regarded as a negligible matter. President Jordan, in his paper in the *Popular Science Monthly,* who endeavors to be fair and

candid after the coeducational way, while approving of these marriages, leaves out all paternal wishes or solicitude for the interest or happiness of the son or daughter. If you ask these people why they do this, they will tell you that coeducation has so sharpened the mind and refined the judgment of young men and women that they may safely be left to their own discretion about marriage. It is impossible to conceive of any other answer that will justify this indifference to the most sacred of human ties, that of the parent for his child. A professor in a college for both sexes, to whom I spoke about student courtship and marriage, stated that such marriages were supposed to have the parental sanction before they were approved by the college authorities. But why should the heads of colleges, like President Jordan, discuss the subject at all; why should another college president recognize it from the commencement

platform; why not ignore it; why should a professor claim, as though it were a merit, that his college only recognized those engagements when they have the approval of the parents? Could the fact be beaten into the heads of men responsible to the public for the conduct of these two-sex colleges that they are bringing education into disrepute, that they are making their institutions the subject of ridicule in the public press, that their function is to educate, and not to organize matrimonial agencies, that they are helping to wreck professional careers, that to nag on premature marriages they are helping to fill the divorce courts with the pitiful tales of broken hearts and sinful lives, that they are helping to fit the matrimonial yoke upon necks which in afterlife will hold in bonds that are a mockery to call holy tired and helpless women and hopeless, irritable men? It is disgusting that President Jordan should assert that

such marriages always turn out happily, an assertion that it is perfectly safe to challenge him to prove. Happy marriages are not made that way. They come deliberately to men who know that they are able to surround the object of their love with the material comforts and accessories that belong to the wife of an educated man, and to those who regard love as a serious thing wherein the man seeks and the woman learns to love. It does not spring from the accidental propinquity of hoiden girls and rollicking young men, or from the formless attachments between romantic girls fresh from the village high school and unfledged youths whose ideal of life and its responsibilities must be as intangible as a dream.

One of the reasons for the complacent attitude of coeducational colleges upon the subject of student marriages is because women are cheap in the matrimonial market. In one instance that came under

the observation of the writer, the young man was cutting his classes and giving up his time to a serious love-affair with a young girl student in a students' boarding-house. He was the son of a prominent and wealthy man, and as soon as the affair became known to his people he was promptly removed and sent to a single-sex college; the worst feature of the case was that the state of feelings between the couple was equally known to the girl's parents, who were residents in a remote part of the town, the girl going to the boarding-house only for her dinner. This is only one instance of many others in which the one who is destined to become the greatest sufferer is the one whose interests are the least regarded. It may not be known to the authorities of bisexual colleges, but it is a fact well known to others, that some parents send their daughters there for the deliberate purpose of securing husbands, or amorous and designing girls

persuade their parents to allow them to attend for that purpose. The facilities afforded by these institutions for such an object make the opportunities afforded by a summer resort appear poor and inadequate. The one gives a scant opportunity at a high price, and the other gives an unlimited opportunity of four years at a low price. Can any one, who knows enough of life to measure the power of women over men whose manhood has not yet developed into the full leaf, doubt what the result would be? In the opportunities afforded by coeducational methods woman is not the tentative side of the problem. It is man that is safeguarded by the precautions of the parents or guardians. It is his career that is interrupted or rendered doubtful by a premature matrimonial experiment. It is woman alone whose future is secured by marriage. This is the social status that is given to the relative value of the union between the

sexes, and this is the value that it must be given in the coeducational institutions. They may model their colleges to conform to a coeducational basis, but they cannot overthrow the usages of society. The value that society places on marriage in its ratio between the sexes is the value that must be given it in the college as in social life. Woman is the commodity, man is the standard of value, and it is in this system of brokerage that these institutions assume to take a part. The liberty of the sexes, which is an American idea, is the license of coeducation. In justice to the inexorable dictum of society, it is only justice to say that the professional man, whose success or failure in life gives social status to the wife, is the only unknown quantity in the matrimonial equation. Yet the authorities of these colleges, hardly any of whom are adepts in social life and usage, assume in their ignorance to approve of student marriages. A generation

past the young professional man on the threshold of his career might marry with some prospect of a successful future. That time has passed. The increasing complexity of business and social life renders it constantly more difficult to earn a living income in the professions. Take the instance of a young doctor located in a busy city. Between the free dispensaries and the hospitals with rival ambulance services, the clang of whose gongs can be heard hourly in the streets, the poor is as far beyond his reach as the rich. He has no prospect except to wait, unless he appeals to the public as the master of some specialty, to secure which, if he is poor, demands self-denial and sacrifice on his part that but few have the courage to encounter. The young lawyer is even in a worse plight. The lucrative business is in the possession of great firms with special partners. Crowded as the courts are with pending cases, the marked tend-

ency of the age is to avoid litigation. In court calendars with hundreds of cases, not more than ten per cent. actually reach a jury. A man working alone with a college education and a degree in law may regard himself fortunate if he can secure a connection with some large firm as a collection attorney, the accounts of which he is not allowed to sue. He is generally absorbed, if he is bright and active, into some legal firm on a salary that is only remarkable in its contrast with what his education has cost him.

The young engineer or architect is confronted by the same tendency of the age to concentration of business and specialism. He is fortunate if he is able to secure a salary, and it is needless to say how small these salaries are to the young graduate. And yet these young men, bright, active, and energetic, if their mental fibre is of the hard and elastic quality that makes for success, will succeed. Now sup-

pose one of these poor young men marries on leaving college, are the conditions such as to make home happy, can he lavish upon a young wife the concentration of feeling and devotion that the average young woman believes that she is entitled to as a wife, and will the first born be welcomed with a joy untinged with regret? Will the average young woman with social ambitions give up a life of comfort and ease to share the home of a young man who is obliged to make this stern hard battle, sharing in his privations, his rigid self-denials, and give way to none of those regrets which are sure to show upon the surface and make life bitter? I ask these questions not of professors of colleges for both sexes, or of such men as President Jordan, but of people of common sense and with a practical view of life, who are none the less capable of love and sacrifice for the sake of those they love.

As more directly relating to the college and the serious object of the training, education, and moral discipline of its undergraduates, student courtship and marriage strike a blow that is fatal to the ideal college life and purpose. The fundamental idea of the college is not to give one an education, for the very good reason that the human mind cannot be educated in four years, but, as far as possible, to perfect its graduates in the use of the tools, so to speak, by the correct use of which the finished student is capable of educating himself. He has acquired the habit of studious application; he can logically arrange and coördinate facts; he has acquired the faculty of correct reasoning by his insight into the higher mathematics; in the laboratories, if he bends all his energies to the task, he is placed in the great highway to education, the knowledge of how to observe and correctly interpret what he sees. These are simply

the instruments of education, and then the college leaves him to educate himself. If he, as a graduate of Yale or Princeton, assumes the attitude before the world that simply as such he is an educated man, he is intellectually doomed, and might better have limited his intellectual training to the three R's, as he would then have preserved his rectitude against the damage of a false assumption. The graduate who realizes that his college has done much in giving him a sure footing on the way to education, if he follows that way in intellectual humility, content to seek, to him will come the satisfying consciousness of a fulfilment of his intellectual life and of work well and wisely done.

The untrained youth who enters college and secures all this in the brief space of four years is the subject of a moral and intellectual revolution. It is a system of brain-building that will demand the constant use of his highest faculties. If,

while he is undergoing this evolution, the professor or college president who believes that he has time for the distraction of love-making must have lost sight of the purpose and aim of the training, which the observing public has too generously taken for granted. If to athletics can be added student love-making, where in the name of common sense is there room for what they are pleased to call higher education? From the standpoint of common experience, as well as from that of the physiologist, let us consider what sex-love means as it comes to the healthy young man and woman as student lovers, probably for the first time in their lives. With the student adolescence is completed and mature functional life has begun. The conscious life is held in the thrall of the emotions. It breaks through the thin crust of the untried and immature restraining forces of the mind. All the higher brain attributes become slaves and

accomplices of the overmastering impulse, which runs riot through the realm of the higher intellectual life. This is not too highly colored when we consider that it is an organic emotion that springs from the subconscious life of nerve centres, over which the will has no control, and mounts upward into the supreme centre of the spiritual life, the cerebrum. Here it revels in the imagination, invades the ideo-motor centres, impairs the memory, disturbs the logical sequence of ideas, and becomes the motor factor in the conscious life. A college professor, in speaking about student love, said that it was a good thing for young men and women, as "they must learn to control such feelings." Very good; that form of learning is not included in the college curriculum; but control does not mean to suppress when it refers to the strongest emotion known in the life of man; it means concealment, which is another unhappy feature of stu-

dent love. It is a college education in deception and addiction to deceit. An emotion which is as nearly a gift from God as any that can find its being in weak human nature is made a thing to be hidden away, and its contentment, for which the touch of a hand or a loving word suffice, is made a sin or a wrong-doing. These young people who are thrown into the environment of stimulating propinquity have a right to love, and, as President Jordan says in his *Science Monthly* paper, "the wonder is rather that there are not more." Under the conditions, however, in which it exists, student love-making gives the first lessons in concealment, and the first conviction that there may be a personal gain in acting a lie. What may be done openly is safe, that which must be concealed is dangerous. When love leads to assignation in student life it is potential immorality. Can anything that is possible to enter into student life offer more serious

interruption to the current of mental activities that favor the best results from his time and opportunities? In some colleges there are chairs of psychology, with laboratories and instruments of precision, so-called. It is fair to ask these professors in colleges for men and women in the interest of science to apply their method of research to the investigation of student love, and deduce from their ascertained facts to what extent the proper observance would be disturbed by the outbreak in any two students of opposite sex of a serious instance of this emotion. It is a proper subject of scientific investigation, but was it ever attempted in the interest of coeducation? On the contrary, it is favored and encouraged. It is safe to take as sober a minded man as President Jordan, in the article just referred to, as one of the most conservative two-sex college presidents. He speaks with a tone of regret: "It is a constant surprise that so many

college men turn from their college associates and marry some earlier or later acquaintance of inferior ability, inferior training, and often inferior personal charm." In President Jordan's opinion, which goes to show how little he understands of love, and how little he appreciates the men who go to college to study instead of making love, he voices the almost universal sentiment of coeducational authorities in regard to student love and marriage. Its existence is a thing hostile to the student life, fatal to the best efforts of mind, a ruinous waste of some part of the too brief four years that must do so much in shaping character and developing the student habit, and forms no part of the argument these people offer upon the subject of coeducation. In this they are deceiving the patrons who entrust their sons and daughters to their care, and are giving a retrograde movement to the cause of higher education.

CHAPTER VII

The Shadow Side of Coeducation

A SERIOUS subject seriously considered may contain many things that will give painful reading to some, and be regarded as of doubtful propriety by others. This chapter would have been omitted had the statements it contains been based upon any other evidence than the personal knowledge of the author. As such it must stand as a document against a policy in education that has made such a shameful record possible. The sin and disgrace recoils not upon the innocent victims, but upon those whose ill-advised and crudely matured plans of coeducation have brought together an ill-assorted concourse of both

sexes without the solicitude and tender restraints of home. With singular inconsequence the imperious laws of sex have been overlooked. It appears impossible to explain the mental attitude of coeducational college authorities upon the subject. It is charity to believe that it is due to ignorance. The denominational influence, which each college was founded to promote, was supposed to throw ample restraints about the students, forgetting that there are border-lines in spiritual growth and fixity beyond which religion never passes, and artificial moral restraints are overwhelmed by organic impulse that obeys the strenous demands of the higher law, and this law is the law of the God of nature. Facing such a problem as this, what is done to adequately safeguard the students, presupposing that coeducation is to continue in its present form?

Religious influence, almost without exception of a denominational character, is

the most active agent in the moral restraint of the students. The promotion of Christian associations among the students, with enforced attendance at college chapel and regular church attendance are the main influences under the direct control of the college authorities. Membership in the better class of secret societies is in many instances dependent upon the correct conduct of the student. The suppression of any known infraction of the college rules and regulations relating to conduct or class work, and the college has gone as far as it can, either in mixed colleges or in those dealing with but one sex. As a matter of fact, faculties of mixed colleges are organized on the basis of colleges for a single sex. The vast difference in the government of institutions implied by the presence of both sexes is not recognized. The chairs are filled mostly by young men, the majority of whom are unmarried, whose duties begin and end

with their class-room work, and however anxious they might be to get in touch with the social and moral life of the students, they have but little tact to go outside of their pedagogical work. In talking with a young professor about a case that was known to both of us, he said: "I have had an interview with the young man and seriously cautioned him, and it has done no good; of course, I made a mistake; I ought to have taken the case before the faculty; now if I were to do so I would be denounced by both classes as a spy and an informer, and not only lose my influence among them, but I might even endanger my position."

The majority of the smaller colleges have no dormitories with proper separation of the sexes, but students are taken into families for board and lodging open to both sexes. It was stated by one professor that this was encouraged as being better than separation of the students, as

it tended to create an atmosphere of "home life." Surely, it must be a professional idea from the point of view of coeducation if a boarding-house could create the atmosphere of a home simply by the commingling of young men and women. The students are placed upon their honor to preserve a proper and discreet deportment toward each other. In older countries, where the sex problem is taken practically, the deportment of the sexes is placed upon a standard of personal honor; yet a vigilant oversight is never relaxed by those who are responsible for the reputation of young women. In this country, among coeducational institutions, this would be resented as an insulting suspicion of a young woman's character. Attending a college for men, she demands the liberties and license of young men, and for the honor of our young women be it said that she acquits herself in her self-respecting attitude

toward her own and the other sex in a manner that would justify, if nothing else were needed, the theory and practice of coeducation. But the advocates of coeducation have no right to trade upon the innate nobleness and fortitude of character of our young women, without respecting it and throwing about it every possible protection. Lead us not into temptation, is the way the Christian is taught to pray by One who knows the human heart in all its weakness. Thousands of the young, the flower of American youth, are being so led by so-called Christian colleges, with what results in wrecked lives or in unforgetable misery the Lord who taught us so to pray alone knows. The young human being at the beginning of functional activity needs the directing and restraining hand of those who have not outlived the memory of the tribulations of their own youth. This is not a surveillance that implies doubt or

suspicion; it is the natural solicitude of those who love and trust, but would shield from harm, temptation, or the appearance of evil. The affections and emotions are the vulnerable places in a woman's armor, irrespective of age. Should she be young, untried, ignorant of the world and of men, warm-hearted and affectionate, in full health and with abundant nutrition, she is safeguarded only by her high and romantic ideas; if any coeducator alleges that such an example can be thrown among a miscellaneous gathering of both sexes for four years without moral risk, I have no words that are proper to use which will fitly describe that man's ignorance of human nature. As a physician, we have watched the after-career of young girls, tenderly reared in Christian homes, who, at the psychological moment have lain prone before the victorious emotions. This type of young woman never recruits the ranks of the unfortunate. It is her

one glimpse at the shadow side of life, whence flows the fountain, to taste of which is not always sin, and that it is not sin is the horror of it. That it did not come of unholy desire, but of emotions and affections that are like peerless gems in the diadem of womanhood, makes the memory abide with her always, regrettable, unappeasable. The material side of her future may not be touched. I have known many of them afterward to become happy wives and mothers, but the galled spot was there, just where the neck-yoke that bears the burden of life presses the hardest upon her tender bosom. How many instances such as this has coeducation in our colleges made possible? Do the members of the faculty know, or, if they know, will they give us their experience? The dean of a college where the sexes are mixed told me he did not believe that it had ever occurred, and those who brought such charges against Christian colleges

were unregenerate or unworthy of belief. The authorities of mixed colleges have no other defence than a general denial.

This is more a question of physiology than of morality, in the need of a suspension of the unrestrained social contact of the sexes during a period of early crisis in functional activity. This is the rule on the part of intelligent parents in every well-regulated home. That this crisis is outlived by every young man and young woman of about twenty is the theory upon which coeducation bases its factor of moral safety. The sexual attributes are oftentimes referred to as an instinct. In the lower ranges of animal life it is actually a madness. Man, who can look into the depths of his own emotions, knows that fasting and prayer and the macerations of the flesh will not suppress those feelings, which are necessary for the perpetuation of his race. These spring from the activity of organic life, the products of

nerve centres and of ganglia, with which the supreme nerve depot, the brain, has nothing to do. The range of the potential activity of these emotions has reached its maximum when physical life has gained its first maturity. It is at this time, when the mind is plastic and open to the impressions of its environment, that wholesome, restraining influences are needed for suppression and self-government. At this time the young instinctively flock together in song and dance, which is right and innocent; but in the normal relations of the sexes these periods of enjoyment cease, and all come under home influence and restraint. It is not so in mixed American colleges of the minor class with the students in common boarding-houses. The strain on the forces of self-suppression must be enormous and in some cases pitiable. Is it any wonder that the moral tension sometimes exceeds its limits, and breaks under the strain? Education under conditions

such as these appears impossible in its higher forms. The chief end of education is to form character, to build up a high degree of receptive intelligence, which will prolong itself beyond the period of training in constant accretions of knowledge and self-government. But here is education inviting the issue of battle with the forces which it is one of its aims to direct and control; trying on the one hand to lead to culture and a spiritual life, while on the other it is cultivating by environment the lowest form of organic emotion, which is obtruding itself into the conscious life, and is not interchangeable with anything spiritual, or mental, which education can create or promote.

There ought not to be any divergent opinions upon this vital point in coeducation. Those who believe in it and those who do not ought to be in accord here, and make the social life of the sexes possible only in the class-room. The extreme to

which college athletics are carried is another element of weakness in the American theory of coeducation. A young woman, who will resist all the blandishments of mind and form, will, in spite of religious training, high social standing, and education, drift into abject sadism in the presence of the prowess of brawn and muscle. It has been so in all ages of the world; from the classic Olympian games, the bloody victories of the arena, the valor of the savage warrior, women have loved and applauded.

It may be objected that we are going far afield, but it must be remembered that we are speaking about the basic emotions that sway and shape human lives as the wind sways the sturdy oak, and not the love that the poet sings, or that has adorned history with the sublimest examples of self-sacrifice and devotion that live eternally as inspirations. Furthermore, the stimulating effect of athletic exhibi-

tions by men upon the emotions of young women at their most susceptible age, appears to be overlooked by those who have grafted the mixed element upon colleges organized solely for men, and to which women, irrespective of fitness, are obliged to conform.

Guardedly as a matter of this nature must be discussed for the general public, enough has been said to show the possible evils that may result from forcing higher education along lines hostile to the physical and moral well-being of young men and women. There are the potential evils, but the actual ones form one of the darkest chapters in the history of coeducation.

To give specific instances of moral downfall directly traceable to the unrestrained relations of the sexes in colleges where coeducation is encouraged to its social limits is painful to the writer, and is sure to be anything but agreeable to the reader. But it becomes a duty in view

of the fact that the advocates of coeducation never defend the method, but assault any one in harsh and insulting terms who may venture to question its merits. Nothing but hard facts, revolting as they may be, will force the conviction that they who object to coeducation as it is conducted in mixed colleges have valid reasons for their objections, and have a right to demand a respectful hearing. To the detailed instances that are offered in evidence, many more could be gathered from the police of Syracuse, who maintain a strict surveillance over those who frequent houses of assignation. It, however, ought not to be necessary to add instances as culminative evidence to convince all right-thinking people of the actual evils inherent to the mingling of the young adult sexes in coeducation.

The son of a well-known professional man sought the advice of a physician for the cure of a venereal disease contracted

from a student. The patient stated that several young men were alike affected, contracted from the same source. Two of them later sought the advice of the same physician. With the purpose of preventing the further spread of the disease, one of the patients was induced to bring the young woman to the physician. She was a small brunette, about twenty-two years of age, very evidently in poor health. She was a student in the classical course, and well along in her junior year. She felt too keenly the disgrace of her position to give confidence to her physician, and it was not until after several weeks, when her health was nearly restored, that she was induced to relate her history. She was the only daughter of a widow living in a small village, who had nearly exhausted her scant resources in educating her daughter. She had received her preparatory education in the local academy, and was admitted to college, conditioned

in two topics, which she made up before the completion of her sophomore year. During her second year her acquaintance with a fellow student had ripened into love, and they became engaged. So far as worldly position was concerned he was rather superior socially to the young lady. When he informed his parents of the engagement, positive objections were made, he was removed from that college and entered in another institution. In the meanwhile, they were for many hours daily in each other's society, often alone, and love's dream had ended in a fateful reality. Her lover had submitted so readily to the orders of his people, and he had withdrawn from his engagement with so little show of feeling, that to her unhappiness was added a dangerous element of cynicism and doubt of the existence of goodness and purity. She was of an ardent, passionate nature, and in her unhappy and discouraged state of

mind nothing but the material side of life appeared left to her. The first was not the final step, but not from waywardness. It was the morbid, hysterical seeking after sympathy and consolation, the wounded spirit, as it were, finding a balm and healing in the very thing from which it had received its hurt. In her weakened powers of resistance, the continued fret and temptation of her environment, were added burdens to drag her down. The accident of disease appeared the one thing needed to show to her the degradation of her position, and that what was once sanctified by love, as so many falsely reason, was now becoming sin. She rescued herself, as many another has done, and completed her college career with moderate success. After teaching school a few years she married, and is now the mother of several children.

The daughter of a man in a good social position in a neighboring town entered col-

lege. She was given a letter of introduction to a physician, well known to her father, soliciting his care when she was in need of professional services. She presented her letter at the only interview the physician ever had with her. He never saw her after, except on rare occasions in the street. One stormy night in November, while waiting near the principal railroad station for a street car, nearly opposite a notorious "Raines law hotel" which had been raided many times by the police, all of which had been duly, and elaborately, reported in the local papers, he saw a couple emerge at the side door. The young woman, especially in manner and dress, differed so completely from the class of women who frequent such resorts, that he gave her close attention. Something familiar in her face and figure recalled the young lady of the letter. On board of the well-lighted car the identification was complete: it was the same

young lady. The problem the doctor had to decide was a delicate one. Between loyalty to his friend and his duty to the young woman, whose physical well-being was left to his charge, there was interposed the instinctive reluctance of a man to be regarded as an intruder where he had no business. At any rate, the letter of introduction warranted his speaking to her; she professed not to know him, which may readily have been the truth, as a year and a half, or more, had passed since the interview. The mention of her father's name and the letter recalled the incident. She showed not the least embarrassment, but there was a glint of defiance and bravado about her face and manner that suggested that she was carrying it off with a high hand, and which, so far as the doctor was concerned, relieved the situation of some of its delicacy. She flushed hotly, not with shame, for she was evidently violently angry, when she was in-

formed of the frightful danger of visiting a resort that was constantly under the espionage of the police, and might have led to her arrest. The resentful interview on the car ended in a reluctant promise to call upon the doctor. It needed a sharp letter to make her keep her promise. The battle that followed was one that threw a strong light on one side of the many phases of human nature. It resulted in her finally consenting to change from the university to a single-sex college for women. This occurred many years ago. The lady is unmarried, and keeps house in a faultless manner in a motherless home. As a matter of fact, so long as it was regarded as a simple question of veracity between the two, the young woman was arrogantly defiant, and it was only when she was convinced that both she and her student lover had been seen and identified by the detective who was assigned to watch the

house that she consented to change her college.

A young woman in her junior year in a certain college was admitted to a private room in a general hospital suffering from sepsis, caused by an attempt to avert the consequences of an affair. The young woman was too sick to submit to any direct inquiries into her history. The appearance of the family that gathered at her bedside was that of the better class of country people. The condition of the patient became so desperate that it was thought proper to take some member of her family into counsel. An older sister was selected to bear the burden of the revelation. Astonishment and incredulity was what was to be expected under the circumstances. Such an event in the girl's life was nearly impossible from what she knew of her sister's character. Modest, diffident, and retiring, truthful and sincere, she would not believe such an affair

possible, nor was her faith shaken until she listened to the confession of her sister. The girl was loyal to her lover, and aside from his being a fellow student his name never passed her lips, in spite of her sister's earnest solicitations. The girl finally recovered, but many months passed before her restoration to full health. Aside from the fact that she left college, nothing was known of her after-history.

All criminologists know that cases of sexual depravity occur, and are as frequent in one sex as the other. They also know that no station or occupation in life is exempt from the occurrence of sporadic cases of this unbalanced condition of the organic emotions. It is not an anomaly, therefore, that the quiet ranks of students in a mixed college should be invaded by the sexual pervert. But what is singular is the fact that the young woman, the subject of this report, passed through college in spite of the suspicion against her which

existed among the students. She had her intimates among the female students, several of whom were observed to be her constant associates when in the streets. As a student she was more than usually bright and quick. She was also a medical case, and as her ailment necessarily revealed her character she talked with a total absence of reticence. It was impossible to associate any consciousness of sin or wrong-doing with the acts which she openly confessed. She professed to believe that all young men and women were just like herself in respect to conduct, and so far as the young men whom she met are concerned she may have had grounds for her belief. She was too shrewd to have anything to do with the fellows on the "hill," as she expressed it. She became engaged to one of them, who graduated a year before her class, and who secured a position on a newspaper. When she graduated she went West and they were married. Their married life

was not successful, and in a couple of years she became a divorced woman. This case would have been omitted were it not for the sincere belief that in a college for women only such a character could not have passed through four years of college life without detection and expulsion. It demonstrates the strange need of oversight in the individual, and indifference to one of the most important sides of education, that which aids in character building. There is nothing in a classical curriculum that does it. It is the handiwork of the instructor who sees in the upbuilding of a symmetrical, perfectly poised character the best side of education.

These cases occurred during a period of about eighteen years. A limited number of cases upon which to predicate a general condemnation of a great system of education, but the offences are of such a character, and so fatally opposed to all ideals of both the methods and final results of

education, that a single instance directly traceable to the commingling of the sexes in education is sufficient to condemn the method.

A sporadic case is as positive proof of the existence of a disease as an epidemic.

We have additional evidence furnished by men in high position in mixed colleges, and who ought to know of these things. President Jordan, in his *Popular Science Monthly* article, says "that evil results sometimes arise — not often, to be sure, but once in awhile." The final clause in this extract is so puerile that one can hardly believe that it is written by a sane man. He traces the cause to adverse conditions: when little girls of preparatory schools and schools of music are mingled with the college students, and given the same freedom, and where young women are forced to rent parlors and "garrets" in houses of an unsympathetic village. But the facts do not bear President Jor-

dan out. Where do the young women students always come from if not from the preparatory school, and in both the Northwestern University and at Syracuse the social disorders originated in the dormitories. President Jordan's attitude toward this question is not that of a Christian gentleman. To confess the possibility of such an evil to a girl because she is poor and is living in a "garret" is grossly unjust. It is an insult to the great army of young women, who are poor and live in "garrets," and yet, so live with soul unsullied, pure in body and in mind. This is only another instance of the weak, silly, and flippant manner that the advocates of coeducation use in treating the serious problems involved in their method.

The chancellor of Syracuse University furnishes the next item of evidence. He refers to it in the simple, manly way that is characteristic. He does not explain it, he offers no insult to a student because

she rooms in a "garret," he makes no statement whether the instances are rare or otherwise; we simply know that the evil exists and is punished. He is speaking of the disciplinary practice of the institution. "It is never the practice to dismiss a student for a single act, unless it be immorality." (Syracuse *Evening Herald,* February 4, 1903.)

With an entire lack of the fitness of things on the part of an ardent coeducational advocate, Prof. E. E. Slosson places the blame for the social evil in mixed colleges upon the women alone. He says: "There are girls who are not fit to be sent to a coeducational college; who get harm and who do harm. When such are detected, the president usually invites them into his private office and gives them the same advice that Hamlet gave to Ophelia." (The *Independent.*) With rare tact he attempts to propitiate the mothers of these erring daughters, by add-

ing that in fairness he ought to state that these cases are not often congenital.

The friends of coeducation may answer that such instances occur in the same class outside of college life. This is true; but is not the answer a fatal objection? If it is a recognized evil, as it certainly is, what precautions have they taken to render the evil impossible in college life? In what way have young men and women been safeguarded against moral contamination? This is what good government and clean society demand. The authorities of mixed colleges must come up to the moral standard of the best homes in the communities in which they exist. They must prove that they do so, and that their system of mixed education contains methods of supervision, direction, and suppression in matter of character and morals, otherwise society will suppress them in the interest of good government.

THE END.

234869
S of C
6122
S2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00027497317